

THE
EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. I. (SECOND EDITION.)

JULY, 1849.

ARTICLE I.

INTRODUCTORY—THE OBJECTS AND POSITION OF THE
EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH in the United States has long felt the necessity of having a Journal for the cultivation and criticism of its own theology and literature, and for the discussion of those questions which, from time to time, excite a peculiar interest in its own bosom. This desire made itself manifest at a very early period in our history by the establishment of periodical publications, first in the German, and afterwards in the English language. We would not cite as evidences of this the "Nachrichten" or "Notices" of the progress of the church, and state of the German missions in the colony of the Saltzburger in Georgia, (published by the zealous Ullsperger of Augsburg, from 1731 to 1767,) or the similar publications relative to the state of things in Pennsylvania and the adjacent colonies, issued under the auspices of the Superintendents of the Orphan-house at Halle, from Mühlenberg's arrival in this country, in 1742, until near the close of the century, (1785.) Though somewhat in the form of our periodicals, these admirable, edifying, and extended publications made their appearance irregularly, sometimes at intervals of several years, and are more like our annual Missionary Reports than literary or theological Journals. But though edited in Germany and frequently accompanied by their excellent European editors with very interesting prefaces and other explanatory matter, they are almost entirely from the pens of our first ministers in Georgia and Pennsylvania, and are equally creditable to their

VOL. I. No. 1.

1

heads and to their hearts, conclusively proving that they were men remarkable alike for their piety and for their learning. They formed a most important connecting link between the church in Europe and America, and are among the most valuable sources of our church history for that period. Still it is not impossible that these publications may have suggested the idea of the *Evangelical Magazine* (*Das evangelische Magazin*) commenced in 1811 under the auspices of the Synod of Pennsylvania and the adjacent States, and continued, though somewhat irregularly, down to the year 1817. In many respects, this oldest may be regarded as the best of all the religious periodicals that have from time to time made their appearance in the church of this country. No one can peruse the volumes which it forms without wishing that it had been continued down to our day, and without being excited to a hearty admiration of the talents, learning, piety, liberal views and good sense of the contributors to its pages. It was under the editorial management of that excellent man, Dr. Helmuth, long the beloved pastor of the German church in Philadelphia, and, so far as we are aware, the principal contributors were his learned colleague Dr. Schmidt, his intimate friends Dr. J. G. Schmucker of York, and Dr. Daniel Kurtz of Baltimore, (the latter two still survive as the connecting link between this generation and the past,) Dr. Lochman, Dr. Endress, and others whose memory is still cherished by our churches. Although the articles in this publication are generally brief, yet they discuss, with marked ability in many cases, some of the most important points in theology, both practical and speculative, whilst the history of the church both in this country and in other parts of the world, and the history of Missions particularly, received great attention.

This periodical was, after an interval of nearly twenty years followed by the *Lutheran Intelligencer* and *Lutheran Magazine*, (the former established in 1825 and the latter in 1827) in both of which the English language was used as the medium of communication between our writers and the public, and (in 1829) by another *German Magazine* which revived the title of the first. In all these, particularly in the first volume of the *Lutheran Magazine*, which was published at Schoharie, New York, the same tendency to discuss interesting points in our church history and doctrines, or such as were connected with our church-government and benevolent enterprises, is manifest. And the same might be said of the *Lutheran Preacher*, edited by Rev. L. Eichelberger in 1833-4,

and the Lutheran Pulpit and Magazine of Rev. C. A. Smith—published from 1837 to 1838.

With so strong a desire in the church to establish periodicals of this kind, it is natural to inquire, why they were not sustained and what were the causes of their discontinuance? The answer to this question, though it is not the same in all cases, is still sufficiently obvious. Two causes especially combined to prevent success in these enterprises generally; first, the want of a public sufficiently numerous, liberal and enlightened to give these publications a sufficient support, and secondly, the want of leisure in editors and contributors to produce such articles as the nature of those publications demanded. The first of these points requires but little elucidation. The condition of the Lutheran church forty years since was very different from what it now is. The number of ministers did not much exceed one hundred, and the number of our members was small in proportion. In the state of society which then prevailed, when such periodicals were just making their appearance even among the English churches of this country possessed of the greatest wealth and strongest in numbers, it was not to be expected that our German churches which labored under such disadvantages in regard to education and intelligence, when nearly all the schools and books, and newspapers even, were in a language unintelligible to them, would be prepared to take much interest in such works. It is, therefore, rather a matter of surprise that the Evangelical Magazine should have been undertaken at all, and so long, and so well sustained, than that it should have been finally abandoned. Even its temporary success is the more remarkable when we recollect that the work was so poorly patronized as not to sustain an Editor, and, consequently, this labor had to be undertaken by men engaged in the active duties of the ministry. And how laborious the life of our pastors then was, all who are informed of the state of things which even now prevails among us may realize. That under these circumstances the work could be conducted at all, is proof of the indefatigable industry and zeal of its editor and of his correspondent similarly situated. That the articles could not be long and elaborate was a necessary result both of these circumstances and of the nature of the work, which would not by its size admit of extended discussions.

The same remarks apply substantially to our English Magazines of a later date, although here there are some peculiarities of circumstances worth noticing. The establishment of these periodicals (1825) may be considered as marking an

epoch in the history of our church in this country, and as something like the culminating point in the transition of its eastern (Atlantic) parts from the German to the English language. Although German had at that time ceased to be spoken in most of the pulpits in the state of N. York, it was still the prevalent tongue in the great body of our church in Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia, and, perhaps, in North Carolina. Here there were very few churches where the preaching was exclusively English, but many where it was entirely German, and generally, where both languages were used, German was predominant. The suspension of the German periodical some years before had, no doubt, in part at least, been caused by the inroads which the English was making upon our German population, by which many of our most intelligent laymen, educated entirely in English, were disqualified from being profited by a periodical published in an other language, and so, of course, could not be expected to contribute to its support. Still, the transition from the German to the English language was slow. Our ministers especially were loth to give up the language of their fathers.— And who can wonder at this or blame them? It was not indeed an absolute renunciation of one of man's most glorious endowments, the gift of speech, but it was the sacrifice of one of the richest, most energetic and most noble of modern languages, for what might be designated as a poor, harsh and unmanageable compound of nearly a dozen different dialects, of scarcely one of which has it retained the excellencies. No man, we believe, has ever preached successfully in the German language, or familiarized himself with its copious and flexible vocabulary and admirable structure, with the ocean-like music and sublimity of its deep intonations, and with its noble, various, and constantly accumulating literature, without preferring it even to his own mother tongue if that happens to be the English. Many of those who first introduced the English into the religious services of our church in this country, and thus prepared the way for the disuse of German as the vehicle for the communication of her thoughts, were far from insensible to these considerations. They were in the habit of preaching it to numerous congregations, and were enthusiastic admirers of the language of their fathers. Their use of English, therefore, whether in the pulpit or in writing, or in common life even, was a matter of stern necessity and not of choice. But they were practical men, and they wished to provide for the necessities of the churches and people committed to their care or within the sphere of their influence.

A large and constantly increasing body of these demanded the English, understood no other language, and our zealous ministers, who, for half a century, generally performed what might with propriety be denominated missionary, rather than pastoral labors, employed that language, just as they would have availed themselves of the Chinese, if Providence had cast their lot in the Celestial Empire.

But there were two very serious disadvantages resulting from this transition from German to English, both of which operated very unfavorably upon the character and prosperity of our first English periodicals and upon our church literature generally. The one was, that but few of our ministers or members were disposed to appear before the public in a language which was to them, like Saul's armor upon David, untried, unfitting, and so, rather an impediment to their movements than an ornament to their person, or their proper weapon for the attack of giant errors, or for the defence of God's truth and Christ's kingdom. To acquire one language, so as to speak and write it with perfect purity and propriety, is the labor of nearly half a lifetime, be that language what it may, and especially is this the case with a language so irregular, so poor and stiff as the English. We need not, therefore, be surprised at the defective style of the productions of most of our first writers of the English language in this country. On the contrary, their fluent use of two languages, so different in character, cannot but excite the admiration of all who have fairly considered the subject, especially if they have had a little experience in attempts to use them. The general use of Latin by the learned in all parts of the world, is no proof of the contrary of what we here assert; for, in the first place, the Latin is not so difficult of acquisition as the English, and was employed only within a limited sphere of ideas; and, secondly, with all that, it was both spoken and written in such a manner as would have thrown Plautus or Cicero into convulsions to have heard it.¹ The other disadvantages resulting from the introduction of the English language, to which we refer, was, that the number of readers was still small, and that for the same reasons, *mutatis mutandis*, as we have already mentioned in the case of our first German periodical. This number was still further reduced and rendered inadequate to the support of either, by the attempt to establish two such periodicals almost simultaneously.

¹ Those who wish to know what the ordinary Latin of the schools was, have only to consult that witty work, *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, commonly ascribed to Ulrich von Hutten.

But the final cause of the abandonment of all these periodicals, both German and English, was, *the establishment of our religious newspapers*. The United States may be considered as the proper home, the real paradise of newspapers, which have here become to nearly our whole population one of the necessities of life almost. It was a matter of course, therefore, that as soon as our Germanic churches became Americanized, they too should want their newspapers. And it was not only right, but necessary that they should have them. We may talk as much as we please about the licentiousness of the press and the mischief which it does (and we fear that not even the so-called religious newspaper can be entirely acquitted of the blame here implied), but these very facts render its employment by the church absolutely necessary. The chivalrous soldier, at the close of the middle ages, frequently mourned over the introduction of gunpowder into warfare, yet no one but a crazy Don Quixote ever thought of renouncing its use and adhering to that antiquated armor and those now powerless weapons which would only render him an easy prey to his adversary. And just so would we be compelled, if only in self-defence, to employ the newspaper in the service of the church militant. Rightly employed, however, no one can doubt that the religious newspaper is an engine more potent for good than for evil, and one which the church not only may employ, but is also under the most sacred obligations so to do.

Still, newspapers are far from answering all the wants of reading and reflecting minds, which it is in the very nature of religion and the church to develope. Religion is not only practical and active, but also contemplative and retired. We are not only to know what is going on in the church and in the world, and to be impelled to do our duty, to act our part in these stirring scenes, but we are also to discuss principles, to examine the foundations upon which our superstructures rest, and carefully to review the course over which we have already gone. But for this are requisite more time and care, greater thoroughness and calmness of investigation than usually marks newspaper articles, is within their very idea or even possible so far as their editors are concerned. The newspaper editor is too busy to go into abstruse investigations and laborious inquiries, nor would his readers pay any attention to them if he did. The object here sought is *news*—the present—that which is upon the surface of things. Hence we can readily explain the fact why a *series* of articles, even the most able, is scarcely read and rarely produces any consider-

able impression upon the public mind. Such articles soon cease to interest as news, and so are not read, or if they are, the premises are forgotten before the conclusion is reached. But let these be elaborated into a single article for the properly conducted Quarterly, where there is room to receive the whole of it at once, and where it may be approached with calm reflection, just as in any other book, and the case will be very different—that which was “a dull series” in the newspaper, in the Quarterly will become, perhaps, “a most popular article,” celebrated either for its sparkling wit or its profound criticism.

But we need not speculate upon this point—it is one that has long been settled all over the world, by almost common consent. The provinces of the Newspaper and of the Review are distinct and well defined. There is a demand for both, and they are by no means antagonistical, but collateral, and should be a mutual help and not obstacles in each other's way. The demand for newspapers among us has been met by the establishment of half a dozen, in all parts of the church, and we think that there is now not only a demand, but likewise a fair opening for a periodical of the other class, if only we can concentrate the confidence and support of the church generally upon it.

It may, however, be made a question whether the Lutheran church of this country has the ability, the intellectual capacity and the pecuniary resources, necessary to produce and sustain such a work, and whether she can be prevailed upon to employ them in this instance—in one word, whether we have better grounds to anticipate success in this enterprise than in those by which it has been, from time to time, preceded? We think we have shown the main causes of the failure, or rather, of the suspension of our former periodicals of this character. These were, first, the small number of our ministers and the laborious life which they were almost universally compelled to lead, whereby they had but little leisure for study; secondly, the want of a public large enough to sustain such undertakings by their patronage; and thirdly, the efforts made to establish our weekly and other religious newspapers. All these obstacles, we think, are to a great extent removed.—When the first Lutheran Magazine was commenced we numbered but little over *one hundred* Lutheran ministers in this country—now we have nearly *seven hundred*. Then we had not a single literary or theological Institution in active operation, now we have three Colleges, seven theological Seminaries, and various Academies or preparatory schools

which are generally conducted by our ministers. Besides this, our older pastoral charges have been greatly divided, so that there are now from two to six ministers where there was formerly but one. This, of course, gives our ministers much more time and opportunity for study than they formerly had.

As to the capacity of our church to conduct such a work, so far as learning and talent are concerned, it, of course, becomes us to speak modestly. We may, however, observe that whilst the prevalence of two languages in our church is a very serious obstacle in the way of our literary efforts, so far as the pulpit and the press are concerned, it yet has its advantages, and perhaps stimulates to study more than it retards progress. Our German origin and associations connect us with the most learned scholars, the most active minds, the most extensive and beautiful literature, and the most profound and most scientific theology in the world. Not only in the libraries of our public Institutions, but in those also of not a few of our ministers, are to be found the works of our ablest theologians both of the earlier periods and of the present day, whether written in Latin or in German. These things cannot but exercise a most important influence upon us, and with all our disadvantages in the want of early and fundamental training, and of that thorough education, which is the only sure basis of literary taste, lofty intellectual attainments and successful authorship, we find a strong tendency among us to study, and the consequent ability to express our thoughts in an effective manner. Besides this, we have always had among us men educated in the best Universities of Germany, which are also from time to time resorted to by our own students from this country, whilst every year increases the number of those who have disciplined their minds by the most thorough education that is to be obtained in the Institutions of the United States. These circumstances, undoubtedly, give us some peculiar advantages. If our English style is not the most elegant and vigorous, we yet have peculiar facilities for enriching English literature and theology by pouring into them something at least from the vast treasures of German erudition, and those new ideas which naturally belong to a class of men trained or brought by their associations under the influence of a mode of thinking and system of theology essentially different from those prevalent among the various English schools which have hitherto predominated in this country. It is true that German literature has for some time past attracted a very considerable amount of attention, both in this country and in Great Britain, and many distinguished scholars have not

only made themselves familiar with the language, but have likewise transferred many choice specimens of its literature into the English. Several of our leading periodicals in this country make up no small part of their contents by translations from the German and abstracts of German works. But it is obvious that we possess peculiar facilities even for this work, in the familiar and living acquaintance of so large a proportion of our ministers with both German and English. It is not uncommon even for our uneducated people when asked which language they understand best, to reply, that they "do not know—they would as leave speak one as the other." And among our educated men and ministers we know of more than one who write and speak both with equal elegance, so that it would be next to impossible for the acutest judge to say that either was not their native tongue. Besides this, we are trained in this literature and theology as ours, we have a personal, a living interest in it, which it is evident that no study of a language for merely literary purposes can ever give. German literature and theology as coming forth from the Lutheran church will, therefore, naturally and necessarily, be something very different from any thing that can be expected in that direction from the mere English or American scholar, who learns German as he would Latin, and looks upon the theological system of Luther with little more sympathy than he has for that of Confucius.—In this respect the position of American scholars generally is essentially different even from that of those in our church (whose number increases every year) who, although not German or Lutheran by descent, are yet so by education and by sympathy, and who trace their spiritual, if not their physical life back to Wittenberg and Augsburg rather than to Oxford or Westminster.

From all these considerations we think it is evident, not only that we have in our church the intellectual ability and the ordinary materials for the successful conduct of such a Review as we propose establishing, but likewise, that we have some peculiar facilities and much that will naturally stimulate and tend to the success of such an undertaking.

As to the pecuniary ability of the church to sustain such a work, it is almost superfluous to discuss the point. Our ministers alone could give it a very respectable list of subscribers, and if to these we should add but one subscriber from each pastoral charge, the work would be able to sustain an editor of its own besides paying its contributors a reasonable compensation for their labors. It may, however, be said

that the work being in English cannot expect to receive the support of the German part of our church. So far as our laity are concerned, this is, undoubtedly, true, but we cannot think the remark applicable to our ministers. Every minister in the United States is under the necessity of acquiring the English language, and even those who come from Germany, if they have not already paid some attention to the subject there, in a short time learn not only to read and speak, but also to write the language of their adopted country. In this respect they often put to the blush those of our American Lutheran ministers (happily few) who having so many inducements and facilities for learning the glorious language of their fathers have not yet attempted it. We already have a considerable number of this part of our ministers upon our subscription list, and we confidently anticipate that we shall receive a very general support from these brethren. When they become acquainted with the design and character of this publication, and its intimate relation to the progress of our proper theology and church principles—when they see that the Lutheran church is one whether it speaks in English or in German, in Danish or Dutch, or whether it exists in Europe or America, in Iceland or Australia—we believe that the great mass of them will feel strongly impelled to sustain this Review, not only by a desire to promote in this way the general prosperity of the church in this part of the world, but also by considerations connected with their own convenience, and improvement. It is true that many of our ministers are in very straightened circumstances, and very poorly supported; but books are to a minister among the first necessities of life, like his tools to the mechanic, and if it at all realizes our expectations, this Review will, ere long, become a book indispensable to all our clergymen. And can it be possible that, after all the progress that the church has made among our English population, so that we now have several hundred churches in which the preaching is exclusively in that language, and when our whole population is estimated at little short of one million, can it be possible, we say, that we are not now able to sustain a periodical the necessity of which has been so long felt and is so generally acknowledged? We think not. We believe that all that is necessary to secure the requisite patronage for such a periodical, is to show that it is needed, and to satisfy the church generally with the soundness of the principles upon which it is to be conducted. With this view we proceed to point out the special reasons which, in our opinion, call for such a publication in the

American Lutheran church at this time, the principles upon which we propose conducting it, and the objects to which we expect to direct our attention.

1. *Such a work is needed for the developement and cultivation of our proper theology and literature.* Although, as we have already stated, the Lutheran church in this country has, within the last twenty years, greatly increased the number of its ministers and members and made great progress in intelligence and liberality, its position is still so peculiar, by the prevalence of two languages in it, and by the want of adequate general education in either, that it is not yet prepared adequately to support, encourage, or produce a literature of its own. Our ministers are still too few in number and most of them educated under too many disadvantages, even where they have the necessary leisure, to cultivate theology as a science, or to produce any great number of works of that character which the proper presentation of our views demands. And even were this difficulty removed, there would be no encouragement for the publication of such works—our reading public is not sufficient to remunerate authors either in German or in English. These difficulties will be met, to a considerable extent, by the publication of a Quarterly Review of the proper dimensions and spirit. Men who have not time to write octavos of a thousand pages, but whose minds are full of the subject, can condense what they have to say into an instructive article of the one-twentieth of that extent. So too, those who would not have either inclination or leisure to read a work of that extent may obtain all that they need from such a condensation. We may, we think, obtain each year from fifty to one hundred carefully prepared articles upon as many different topics in theology and church literature, and suitable to the pages of a review, and our studious ministers and intelligent people may readily and profitably read them. But how different would be the case if independent volumes were to be written upon all these topics! Our ministers would neither have time nor ability to write, nor our people to read, and much less disposition to purchase such a mass of books.

It may, however, be inquired, whether it is necessary for us to discuss such a variety of points, and whether we cannot obtain what we here speak of either from works now accessible to us or from periodicals already established and sustaining a high and merited reputation in this country? Our intelligent ministers will not ask such a question. They well know how difficult it is to supply their libraries with suitable

books—books breathing the spirit and fully presenting the doctrines of the church with which they are identified. They can indeed obtain such works, in almost any quantity, from Germany, but that is attended with great delay and expense, whilst a great many questions of peculiar interest to the church in these “ends of the earth,” are, of course, of but subordinate interest there. As to our English periodicals, they, are, natusally and necessarily, echoes of the sentiments prevalent in that particular section of the church by which they are originated or sustained, and so, in various respects, antagonistic to that system of doctrines and to that ecclesiastical organization embraced by our church, embalmed in our hearts, and commending itself to our judgments and feelings. Of different national and ecclesiastical descent from us, the other churches of this country take no interest in ten thousand matters that are to us of the holiest character. Our Episcopal brethren will dwell with the fondest interest upon the founding of Jamestown and the vicissitudes of *their* American church which was there cradled, but feel no such sympathy with the church which was, nearly at the same time, planted upon the banks of the Delaware, unless under the mistaken impression that our Swedish Evangelical church is based upon the same principles as the English hierarchy. So our New England friends never grow weary of investigating the history of the little company that was driven by the ruthless hand of persecution from England to Holland, and then borne by the Mayflower to the bleak coast of Massachusetts. But no such curiosity is felt by them in regard to that band of exiles who, after centuries of oppression for conscience’ sake, endured by generation after generation, upon the mountains and in the mines and in the sweet vallies of Saltzburg, at length found refuge in the wild woods of Georgia. So the Presbyterian will tell of the sufferings of his forefathers upon the mountains and in the glens, on the hillsides and upon the bleak moors of “bonnie Scotland,” and will thus endear the “Shorter Catechism” to his children, and will inculcate the “Westminster Confession” upon his sons as a precious legacy from past ages to the present, but he does not feel the same personal interest in the heroic achievements of Germany, where a toleration of the pure doctrines of the Augsburg Confession was only extorted from reluctant emperors and popes after a century of wars and persecutions. We do not wonder at these feelings—they are perfectly natural. But the Lutheran church also has a history in which we are most deeply interested, and doctrines that are equally

dear to us, a literature, too, that is peculiarly her own. And if we wish to cultivate, to understand, to cherish these we must do it for ourselves—we cannot expect any of our brethren of other denominations, however liberal, to do this for us. This is sufficiently manifested even in D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, where, if Luther is for a while a hero, it is only until Zwingli and Calvin come upon the stage! And if this is the fact in regard to church history, how much more must it be the case in regard to doctrines in which it is still more difficult for those who differ to do justice to one another. And of this we may certainly be assured, that if we do not explain and defend our own doctrines no body else will do it for us.

2. *This is rendered the more necessary by the transition of a large part of our church in this country from the German to the English language.* As is well known, the Lutheran church was never established as such in the British Islands. Although the first English and Scotch Reformers received their views from Wittenberg, owing to various circumstances, the system there taught was never properly developed in Great Britain. It is true the Church of England (as by law established) has been called "the church Lutheranizing" (*ecclesia lutheranizans*); still, Calvin exerted rather a stronger influence over it than Luther. It is, therefore, only since her acclimation in the United States that the Lutheran church has made use of the English language, and even here it is only within the last twenty-five years that she can be said to have employed it for sacred purposes. It is not strange, therefore, that she has no literature in this language. National literature is always of slow growth. It is only of late that English writers have ceased to ask with contempt, "who reads an *American* book?" And even now the great mass of books issued from the American press are reprints of English publications, and all the leading British periodicals are regularly republished here, having, perhaps, as large a circulation on this as on the other side of the Atlantic. When, therefore, we reflect that all our English Lutheran literature has to be produced in this country and in a church the great mass of whose members, even here, still speak German, no one need wonder at its scantiness or at its deficiencies. As in American literature generally, so in that of our American Lutheran church particularly, no great amount of originality is to be looked for, for some time to come. We have too much to do with the practical, are too much occupied with the active duties of life, have been too

little trained to abstruse speculations and learned investigations to have time or ability for such pursuits. We must, therefore, draw upon what our fathers and brethren upon the other side of the Atlantic and the North Sea have done for us. And here we have most ample resources upon which to fall back. The Puritan is proud of his "old divines," the Episcopalian is in raptures over the productions of the "British Reformers," and republishes from time to time the "Complete works" of Jeremy Taylor, and Hooker, and Leighton, and Reynolds, and Barrow, and Tillotson and other illustrious names of that class—and this is the foundation upon which their theology is built—these are the great teachers to whom they go to school. But the Lutheran church has names equally illustrious and to whose teachings she can resort with equal confidence. But, unfortunately, their works are inaccessible to the great mass of our church, both ministers and people, in this country, especially to those who use only the English language. To transfer these to the English language and give them their legitimate influence in this part of the church is evidently a duty that we owe both to them and to ourselves. This, however, as experience abundantly testifies, is not a work that can be done at once. As our Lutheran theological literature has been the growth of centuries, it cannot in a single day nor in a single generation, even, be transferred to a language in which it has hitherto been almost an entire stranger. Besides, so far as this is to be done by translation, peculiar qualifications are required for this work. To write well in one language is not the most common attainment, and the difficulty is, of course, increased where two are concerned. This we see exemplified in translations without number. As an instance in point we may cite Cole's translations of Luther, by which one of the most energetic and liveliest of writers that ever wielded the pen, all whose words are said to have been "thunder and lightning,"¹ has been transformed into one of the tamest and most uninteresting. Nor have we been without experience of this same thing in this country. And yet there is, evidently, no impossibility in the nature of the case, as we see by the number of successful translations that have been made into all languages, of which our German and English versions of the Bible are examples that are admitted upon all hands. In this respect we suppose that a Review, such as we contemplate, will render essential service, first, by familiarizing us with the literature in question, and secondly, by

¹ "Donner und Blitzesschlag, Luther, ist all deine Sprach."—*MEL.*

giving this form of literary training, and more frequent practice in writing and translating to a considerable body of men in the church, and by creating and refining the taste for these things among our people generally.

3. *Such a work is necessary to the proper union and coöperation, and to the highest usefulness and efficiency of the Lutheran church in this country.* It cannot but be a matter of deep regret to all who take an interest in her prosperity, that the Lutheran church in the United States is so imperfectly united, and that its different parts, instead of drawing nearer together, seem of late to have a tendency to separate further and array themselves more decidedly against each other. We cannot conceal the fact that a very considerable diversity of views, both as regards doctrine and practice, prevails among us. These conflicting elements are more or less separated into different ecclesiastical organizations and have separate organs in newspapers, which, patronized exclusively by one party, do not reach, and so exert no influence upon the other. The friendly intercourse between these parties will diminish as their collisions increase, and their sympathies are in great danger of being entirely alienated from one another. This, we think, should, if possible, be prevented, and against this we propose the Evangelical Review as a remedy. Here we propose that all parts of the church should meet each other as upon neutral ground, and hold friendly intercourse, and exchange opinions with each other. Here we think that they will find that they have much in common — not only a common christianity, but also a common origin, a common history, common sympathies, and many common tendencies, religious principles, and usages. And these, undoubtedly, are strong bonds by which to attract and hold them together. Nor do we despair of this result. With all our diversities of views and of practice, and notwithstanding all the modifications that a part of our church has undergone in this country, we believe that the church is still essentially one, and has a common substratum of doctrinal and religious character which only requires to be properly developed in order to bring us together in that oneness of faith which has always so strongly characterized the Lutheran church. And we are the more encouraged in this hope by the past history of the church both in this country and in Europe. There has never been the same tendency to separation in our communion as in the English and Reformed churches generally. We see this remarkably exemplified in the late United Church of Prussia. Although all

orthodox Lutherans were most decidedly opposed to that movement, and although they constituted the great mass of the people who were to be affected by its operation, rather than have even the appearance of schism, most of them peacefully submitted to one of the most high-handed outrages upon the rights of conscience and the freedom of worship ever witnessed, at least in so called Protestant countries.—The movement now in progress throughout Germany for the reestablishment of the Lutheran church, wherever it had been thus prostrated, is also a proof of the vitality of our faith and of the firm hold that it has taken upon the minds and consciences of its children. Similar to this has been the state of things in this country. There has been among us no tendency to the formation of sects, or to the absolute separation of different sections from each other. However widely we have differed in our views, however violent our collisions, we have never yet formed a "New Lutheran" or an "Old Lutheran," a "Radical" or a "Conservative," a "Northern" or a "Southern Lutheran church." And, however loosely they may have been received, no part of the church has ever yet formally announced its rejection of the Augsburg Confession, or the Shorter Catechism, or, in short, of any of our symbolical books. Nor has there yet been any serious attempt to set up any other doctrinal basis as a substitute for them, or any thing like a denial of the Lutheran character of those who receive them. On the contrary, even where new Synods have been formed by the collision of different views and tendencies, these have not professed any difference in regard to what was fundamental either to Christianity or to Lutheranism, and the parties thus separated have soon learned to live together in peace, and to acknowledge each other as brethren of the same church. It is true that a large number of our members have gone into other denominations, but this has generally resulted, not from dissatisfaction with the religious system of the church, but chiefly from the change of language, the want of preaching in the only language that they understood, or the utter destitution of all church organization and church privileges. And here, too, it is remarkable that our scattered and neglected people have so long retained their attachment to a church from whose communion they were so entirely cut off, and that after years of absence from our fold they have been so readily gathered into it and have, in so many instances, returned to it from other denominations with which they had in the mean time connected themselves.

These are some of the grounds of our hope for the ultimate union of all parts of the Lutheran church both in doctrinal views and in external organization. But in order that this may take place it is necessary that we should both know ourselves, and know each other, as Lutherans. In the *Ev. Review*, therefore, we propose to give all parts of the church an opportunity of exhibiting their sentiments. Nor are we afraid that the exhibition of conflicting views will have a tendency to repel us from each other. The experience of every day proves the contrary of this. In civil life the collision of opposite parties, in our national legislature, for instance, does not tend to the destruction of our national union. On the contrary, the first step towards disunion or civil war would be the separation of the different parties into different conventions. So in ecclesiastical affairs, when we come together in our Synods the expression of the most opposite views does not separate us. It is, in fact, only by the comparison of opposite views and by hearing what is said in favor of each that we are harmonized in feeling and united in action. The most hopeless kind of separation is, where the opposite parties will not meet for argument nor listen to each other. If, therefore, the most opposite views should be expressed in this *Review*, we shall by no means despair of reconciling them or of finally bringing together in the unity of our common faith the different parties that advance them. Our *Review* is not intended as an authoritative exposition of either the doctrines of the Bible or of the Lutheran church. All that we propose is, that the different parts of the church should here express their views and the grounds upon which they are based and give each other a calm and patient hearing. If they do so, we cannot but hope for the happiest results. With prayer to the Great Head of the Church that He would by His Spirit direct us into the truth of His word, we cannot doubt that He will establish us in our most holy faith, so that we "all may be one even as He and the Father are one."

4. These explanations, we hope, will leave no doubt as to the *position of this Review*. *It is Lutheran, in the broadest and in the strictest sense of the term.* It is consecrated especially to the interests, to the history, to the theology, to the literature of the Lutheran church in this and in all parts of the world. And, as a necessary result of this, it belongs to no particular school or party in the Lutheran church. Taking its stand between Rationalism on the one hand and Romanism on the other, it will endeavor to represent the common sentiments of all who are gathered within the pale of our widely

extended communion, and will take especial pains to make known the views and feelings of all parts of the church in this country especially. And whilst we shall, as already stated, freely admit articles expressing very different ideas, we shall do this, not from a love of controversy or because this is one of our objects, but as the necessary means for the establishment of peace and union among us, by leading us to the same truth, establishing a mutual understanding, and securing sincere respect, and love, and confidence. But whilst we do not shrink from the presentation of these diversities, we hope that it will soon be found that the points wherein we agree are much more numerous than those wherein we differ, and that there is nothing to prevent us from growing up into "one body" as living members of the same glorious Head. From controversial articles also, we shall endeavor to remove all that asperity and personality, and every thing like a narrow and local character, by which christian intercourse and rational discussion have been so often converted into selfish strife and vain wrangling for victory.

5. *But whilst we thus plainly announce our adherence and attachment to the church with which we are connected, we do not wish to be understood as occupying a hostile position towards any other part of Christendom.* On the contrary, we see much to love and admire in our brethren of other denominations. We acknowledge the Church of England and her representative in the United States as "the oldest daughter of the Reformation," a church that is *almost* Lutheran. We admire the free spirit, the vigorous character, the active enterprize and practical tendencies of the sons of the Puritans, the disciples of Calvin and of Knox. We also acknowledge the service done to religion by our Methodist and Baptist brethren and trust that we are ready to rejoice with the angels in heaven over every soul whom they convert, and who is washed in that "fountain which has been opened in the house of David for sin and for uncleanness." But in exhibiting and defending the truth as our church has learned it (taught, as we believe, by the Holy Ghost from the word of God) and transmitted it to us, we believe we are doing no wrong, but great service to these brethren before whom we desire to let our light shine, that, if they cannot be brought to see matters as we do, they may at least learn to know us better and respect us so far as we deserve their respect. We trust that this Review will not be found deficient in a liberal spirit, and that it will never unnecessarily interfere with, or

assail, or misrepresent even those from whom it may most widely differ.

6. Finally, whilst theology, biblical criticism, church history, church government, missions, education and practical christianity, together with the criticism of works in all these departments will be the chief objects of our attention in this Review, we shall also feel at liberty to discuss other points of general interest in literature or in the social and moral condition of the world, or of any particular part of it—as is customary in similar publications. Especially shall we feel interested in the state of education both in our common schools and in our higher seminaries of learning, believing, as we do, that nothing is more intimately connected with the prosperity of the church and the well-being of mankind. We shall also take the usual notice of new publications, so far as we consider them to fall within the scope of our Review, favorable to the diffusion of sound knowledge, and not injurious to good morals. Works of this character we shall be pleased to receive from publishers, but do not wish our tables to be burthened with works of fiction, which we have neither time nor inclination to read, and are, therefore, unqualified to criticise or to describe. R.

ARTICLE II.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

It has been a matter of surprise to many, that the Germans, who in their native country are so highly distinguished for their schools and universities, and for the extent of their literary attainments, have been, as a body, so indifferent to this subject here in the land of their adoption. With comparatively few exceptions, all that was desired for their children by the early German settlers in this country, was the ability to read and write and cast accounts. It would seem as though the great object at which they aimed was the acquisition of wealth, and that every thing else was neglected. It is yet within the recollection of many that "ignorant" was a common epithet applied to the German, and what was true of the great mass in this country was unjustly applied, as a term of reproach,

to the father-land. Dr. Kunze, in his correspondence with the directors of the Orphan house at Halle, writes, "The Germans here are, in general, not very desirous of obtaining an acquaintance with the sciences, as they see very little opportunity of deriving external advantage from them; consequently, their notions of things are very limited. According to this standard the English among us form their opinion of all Germany."¹ The solution of this apparent enigma is found in the fact stated by the same writer. "The Germans," says he, "are composed, *for the most part*, of those inhabitants of the Palatinate, Würtemberg and Alsace, who, in their native country, belonged to the lower classes, and were oppressed with extreme poverty. Their sufferings at home were so great, that any other country seemed a refuge; and their poverty was so extreme that, in order to leave their native land, many of them had to submit to years of servitude in the land of their adoption." To expect, from men of this description, enlarged views on the subject of education, or on any subject, or to expect that they should lay the foundations of liberal institutions in science and theology, broad and deep, and for the benefit of all future times, is to form expectations which no reasonable person can entertain. There were, however, amongst the emigrants, men of lofty genius, profound scholarship, vast attainments and ardent piety, who, from the time of their arrival in this country, thought and labored and prayed for the welfare of their brethren. With the early Lutheran ministers, educated in the universities and sent forth by the piety and liberality of the mother country, it was from the beginning a subject of painful interest, how they could elevate the people from their ignorance and sin, and how they could supply the destitute with a living ministry. Their thoughts and purposes, though to many but a bright day-dream, extended even beyond the spiritual necessities of their brethren: they pitied the red man of the forest and the negro on the islands, and laid their plans to establish an Institution by which these benevolent feelings of their hearts, in reference both to their brethren and to the heathen, might be fully carried into execution. The rapidly increasing number of emigrants, the paucity of ministers, arising in some measure from the heavy expenses of the voyage, compelled the

¹ "Die Deutschen sind hier, im Ganzen gerechnet, nicht sehr begierig Wissenschaften zu erlernen, zumal sie wenige Gelegenheit vor sich sehen, davon äusserliche Vortheile zu erlangen, daher haben sie auch von angebreiteter Erkenntniss wenigen Begriff; wornach denn die hiesigen Engländer ganz Teutschland beurtheilen."—*Hallische Nachrichten*, p. 1377.

German ministers in this country, to occupy all their time in the active duties of their pastoral office. It was not until thirty years after the arrival of the elder Mühlenberg in this country that any successful efforts were put forth to establish a school of a high order for the benefit of our German population. Under the pressure of difficulties increasing daily, through the arrival of new emigrants and the want of well-qualified ministers to serve them, the elder Mühlenberg made the experiment of employing, as Deacons and helpers, men of exemplary piety and well-grounded in the doctrines of the church, whose duty it was to indoctrinate the youth of the church in the principles of the word of God. This step was deemed necessary under the circumstances, inasmuch as the general poverty of the people, and the debts resting upon the most of the churches for the erection of church edifices, precluded the hope of procuring adequate funds for the founding of such an institution as the wants of the church required. As these Deacons, or Catechists, were educated by experienced and learned ministers, and were governed by them in their labors among the people, they, in some instances, made such progress in knowledge and were so useful that they were esteemed "worthy of double honor," and were introduced into the number of ordained ministers.¹ This expedient growing out of the necessities of the church, as might be supposed, failed to furnish a supply of ministers adequate either as to qualifications or in number.

After the arrival of Dr. Kunze in 1770, a more direct effort was made to lay the foundations of an institution which should be permanent and elevating in its influence on the Germans. Kunze was full of this idea. It haunted him wherever he went, and could not be banished by the multiplicity of engagements growing out of his profession. He writes, that he "has discovered in himself a peculiar preclivity to be engaged in a school in which the languages and sciences are taught, and that, notwithstanding his multiplied duties, he is burdened with the conception of establishing, by the help of God, an Institution of this description among the Germans of Pennsylvania." Every institution must have a beginning, and Kunze thought that if he could by any honest means become the possessor of twenty pounds, he would purchase the first German student who was encumbered with the debt of his passage to this country and commence a Latin school in an upper chamber of his dwelling.² The next day a Mr. Leps,

¹ Hal. Nach. p. 1253. ² Ib. p. 1375 to 1385.

a student from the University of Halle, unencumbered with debt, but poor, presented himself. The proposition is at once made that he open a classical school, and notice to that effect is published in the newspapers of the city. No sooner did this appear than one of the most respectable members of the Lutheran congregation came to the assistance of Kunze, expressed his great gratification at the announcement of the proposed school, and, with another of a similar spirit, obtained the required number of subscribers. An association is formed with the title "*The Society for the advancement of Christianity and all useful knowledge among the Germans in America.*" Mr. Leps was employed, and the school was opened, in the presence of the subscribers, with singing and prayer, on the 17th of February, 1773. The beginning was small, (with only fifteen scholars,) but the conception was worthy of a lofty and a christian mind. The Constitution, drafted by Kunze, contemplated three classes of members: 1st, A Board of twenty-four, resident in Philadelphia, whose business it was to conduct the Institution and attend to its daily wants. 2d, Collegiate and other associations formed for useful purposes. These were to be interested in the incipient Institution, by means of correspondence, and were to be requested to give their advice, were authorized to make propositions to the Board in Philadelphia, and were to be requested to aid by donations of books and money presented by themselves, or to become the channels of such donations from others. 3d, Foreign societies and Ministeria were requested to appoint, out of their number, one or two procurators, for the American Association, who should conduct the correspondence. They were also requested to form an American treasury and to make propositions and to give advice for the benefit of the incipient Institution. Thus Kunze imagined that a lively and a permanent interest could be awakened for the child of his own creation both in America and in the mother country. Anxiously and ardently pursuing what he conceived to be, and with justice, a great Institution for the Germans and their posterity, he submissively and patiently followed the leadings of Divine providence. His object was grand and comprehensive, only too much so for the means within his control; and yet, we cannot repress the conviction that, if his health had been continued and the obstructions growing out of the Revolutionary struggle had not interposed, his heart would have rejoiced in the success of the enterprize. Out of this Association was to grow an Orphan and Alms house, the seat of Missions to the Indians, and before them all, in point of time,

a *University* in which were to be taught the higher branches of science, English law, medicine and theology. In reference to this Association and its anticipated results, Freylinghausen records his views and feelings, as follows: "Every one must admit that the object of Pastor Kunze deserves every encouragement and support, and that such a Seminary would be of wide-spread usefulness, should it please God to grant adequate means to sustain in it a sufficient number of suitable laborers, (teachers) and awaken amongst our German fellow-believers in America a relish for the higher sciences. In this Seminary the brethren must by all means first direct their attention to the higher sciences, (a course preparatory to a University,) law, medicine, and theology. To the last, the brethren will doubtless next direct their attention, inasmuch as they themselves are capable of giving instruction in it, in order that in this Institution there may be prepared well qualified preachers for the German congregations. In addition to this, if God would qualify some of the young with necessary gifts, and awaken in them a constraining love for the conversion of the wild Americans, Philadelphia would be the most suitable place to train them and to establish and sustain such a mission."¹ It is much to be lamented that Pastor Kunze's health, never vigorous, was so impaired, and for such a length of time, that he was unable to mature and publish his plans, until the war of the Revolution disturbed the intercourse with the mother country and threw the congregations in this country into such confusion that his efforts were, in that direction, temporarily suspended.

No certain information is in the possession of the writer to enable him to ascertain the condition of the classical school established under the organization just referred to, until the year 1779, when we find it yet in existence. During this year the University of Pennsylvania was established in Philadelphia under the auspices of the State, and amongst the number of its trustees were the clergymen of the different denominations of Christians then established in the city. Among these Pastor Kunze occupied a prominent and influential position. He was one of a Committee of five to report a plan for the University, and thus, in the good providence of God, occupied not only the position which he most desired, but which he was so well qualified to fill. Ever cherishing the idea of an establishment for the benefit of the Germans, he commanded sufficient influence to secure the appointment

¹ Hal. Nach., pp. 1504, 5, and 1510.

of a German Professor of Philology, with a Tutor as an assistant, whilst the German students enjoyed the privilege of daily instruction in the English language.¹ Kunze was elected Professor, and in a short time had the satisfaction of witnessing the attendance of upwards of thirty students. About this time he accepted an invitation to settle in the city of New York, influenced chiefly by the hope of there advancing the interest of Theological education in the Lutheran church. The Legislature of the state of New York had passed an Act for the establishment of a University, in which Act it was proposed that, if any congregation or individual would secure the annual payment of two hundred bushels of wheat, there should be elected, in the University, a Professor of theology, of the denomination to which the donors belonged, or some person whom they might designate.² Kunze wrote immediately to Germany, on this subject, and hoped that the way was opened for the permanent endowment of a theological professorship of theology for the Lutheran church. His own language on this subject may express his views more fully. He writes to Dr. Freylinghausen as follows: "In my letter to Mr. Pasche, I stated the contents of an article in our University-act by which authority is given to establish a Theological professorship, so soon as a fund shall have been collected, which will yield annually two hundred bushels of wheat, or £80 of our currency; and, as I added, this article particularly influenced me to accept of the invitation to New York. Such an Institution, by which men can be prepared for the sanctuary, our church in North America needs, where the harvest is great, and the want of faithful laborers is yet greater. I came here (he writes from New York) in the hope that God would, from time to time, awaken those who, in accordance with this article, would promote the welfare of our Evangelical church in this part of the world. The Institution in Philadelphia might, by degrees, send us students, especially if it pleased the Lord of the vineyard to found certain benefactions (scholarships) for those who would devote themselves to the work, but whose parents are too poor to sustain them in the University, as we can in an especial manner depend upon the poor. My eyes are here directed to the Lord."³ It was the fond hope of Dr. Kunze that many poor and pious men would receive their preparatory education in the University of Pennsylvania, sustained by patrons in this country and in Germany, and then, by the endowment of

¹ Hal. Nach., p. 1421. ² Ib. p. 1510. ³ Ib. p. 1504, 5, and 1510.

a Theological professorship in the University of New York, they could there receive their theological training. Mr. Schmidt succeeded Dr. Kunze as preacher, and Dr. Helmuth succeeded him as Professor of German in the University of Pennsylvania. The prospects of education in the church became brighter. "Nothing," writes Mr. Schmidt,¹ "lies nearer the hearts of us preachers than a German educational institution, in which the youth can be prepared for the peculiar service of the church. We have, it is true, a share in the University located here, which we improve. The German section of the University, which receives from the trustees annually six hundred pounds Pennsylvania currency, is not without hope for the future. Helmuth, who superintends this department, teaches seven hours daily, giving instruction in Latin and Greek to the German youth and in German to the English students. As soon as he accepted the professorship to which he was elected, the number of students, which had been small during the preceding year, increased to more than seventy, among whom are some who have determined to study theology. We two preachers, in Philadelphia, propose, in the approaching winter, to make a beginning, in the name of the Lord, to impart to them instruction in the different parts of theology, and, as far as our feeble abilities extend, to prepare them for the office of the ministry. It is true that our time is much circumscribed, and our fitness for such an important work small, yet that which is attempted in the fear of the Lord and from no selfish motive, cannot remain wholly without a blessing."

Thus we see what were the feelings and views of the leading ministers of our church in the first half century of her existence in this country; and what were their feelings and sentiments, as expressed in their correspondence with the mother country. Such also we may presume were those of the brethren located in the interior of the land. Nothing of permanent value to the church grew out of the effort either in Philadelphia or New York. All that could be effected, by the personal efforts of these laborious and self-denying men, was accomplished, but with nothing to sustain them except sympathy from abroad and a pittance from their brethren at home, the enterprize sank with the men who conceived it. Their experience and ours shows most clearly that in one respect they failed in foresight. They conceived of nothing but German churches and German preachers. It seems as

¹ Hal. Nach., p. 1516.

though it never entered their minds, that the rising generation of Germans would grow up in the language and manners and tastes of the people with whom they daily associated; and that therefore their church policy, so far as these things prevailed, must be adapted to them. Here was a great and fatal mistake. They desired to build up the church in the German language exclusively, without any regard to the ordinary language of business, of the schools, the pulpit, the courts of justice, and of nineteen-twentieths of the people. Under a similar policy, the Swedish church has become extinct and the descendants of the first emigrants, like many of the Reformed and Lutheran churches, have been merged in the denominations wholly English. Had these learned and self-denying men, whom we venerate and love to honor, at the same time directed their attention to the establishment of English schools, and to the education of men to preach in the English as well as in the German language, our Germanic churches at this day would exhibit a very different aspect.

This is especially true of the congregations in cities and large towns where the influence of the English language, for obvious reasons, would be sooner felt. How else can we account for the fact, that, during almost an entire century, the German churches in New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, did not increase as did others, with the population of these cities? There were no English congregations formed in their connection, whilst other denominations using the English language multiplied rapidly. At this day we have one German and two English congregations in the city of Philadelphia, when the churches of other denominations number theirs by dozens. One century ago no denomination in that city possessed more than one congregation, and of them all the Lutheran was the most numerous.¹ The city of New York, until within a few years, contained but one German Lutheran congregation. It contained one in the time of Kunze. What has become of the descendants of the Germans who, during successive periods, constituted that congregation? They are now a part of the bone and sinew of the English churches.

So far, however, as we are enabled to gather their views of the importance of theology and the best mode of studying it, they present to us a model worthy of imitation. They commenced in the right way, viz. to lay its foundations in the primary and academic education of the people. Every congregation was, if possible, furnished with a schoolmaster who

¹ Hal. Nach., p. 12.

also acted as chorister. The school-house was placed near the church; and was justly regarded as a part of the system of christian education. The schoolmaster, when of proper qualifications, and such only were sought, next to the preacher, was the most important and most useful personage in the congregation. He not only taught the Catechism, in addition to the ordinary instruction of a school, but in the absence of the pastor, and by his direction, conducted religious exercises in the church. During their synodical sessions, the condition of the parochial school was investigated as carefully as the state of the congregation. In addition to this, a project for educating the poor was laid before the proprietors of the Province of Pennsylvania in consequence of which a fund was established in England for the support of free schools, in the German and English languages, at places in Pennsylvania where they were most needed; and constantly from four to six of the pupils, possessing good talents, enjoyed the privilege of attending the instructions of the University of Oxford.¹ As a part of a regular system, the value of which they themselves had experienced in the land of their fathers, they established Academies and assisted in the formation and support of Colleges and Universities, as far as their influence extended. Hence the interest they felt in the Universities of Pennsylvania and of New York, and the active part which they took in their instruction. The Lutheran churches derived but little advantage from these institutions, because the young, educated in them classically and scientifically, through the medium of the English language, having lost the language of their fathers and finding no churches where the ministrations were intelligible to them, or where they could minister at the altar, would naturally attach themselves to the English churches. Various facts in their history confirm this supposition.

We now part with the men who composed the pioneers of Lutheranism, who laid the foundations of the church in this country in troublous times, amidst the poverty incident to a newly settled country, and the sufferings attendant upon a long continued and sanguinary war. Their successors in office, though more successful in adapting themselves to the circumstances in which they are placed, so far as the prevailing language and manners of the people are concerned, have displayed much less wisdom in their educational plans, and have accomplished much less in the great work of theological

¹ Hal. Nach., p. 661, and 956.

education. We have, it is true, six or seven theological Seminaries which have seen the light, and a few more are yet lingering, amidst the agonies of parturition; but what of that? Have we any theologians or theological literature as their fruits? We would not institute any invidious comparisons, but we cannot refrain from expressing the conviction that we have but few men, if any, who have grown up under the new order of things, to compare—I mean in theology—with such men as Endress, Göring, and others, who were trained under the fathers of the church. We have commenced at the end, and not at the beginning. We have erroneously imagined that theological Seminaries would supply the church, as a necessary consequence, with sound theologians, as well as active pastors, and that the creation of these institutions would, with the force of an impelling cause, produce the desired effect. One effect is apparent to every close observer that, whilst we have many devotedly pious pastors and impressive preachers, we have very few theologians. There is a vast difference between men, who, with a slender intellectual furniture, present stirring appeals to the people, and produce a great excitement on the subject of religion, and then leave their spiritual wants unsupplied, and the men who instruct their congregations thoroughly in the wholesome doctrines of the church and who, when God blesses them with a revival of religion, know how to feed with milk or with strong meat. The activity, zeal, liberality, and indeed the general efficiency of the church, will depend very much upon the enlarged views which they receive of truth and duty through the ministrations of the sacred desk.

The weak point in our church has been, and continues to be, to a great extent, the want of education in all its grades, from the lowest to the highest. Primary education is neglected, congregational schools can hardly be said to exist among us, which, in the first half century of the church in this country, were its glory. The same is true of the higher grades of education, academic and collegiate. Theology grows out of the masses of the church, just as do ministers of the gospel. When the people are educated, by which I mean, mentally disciplined, and, by the grace of God, become christians, they will necessarily make the work of God their study. They will be capable of comprehending and grasping the momentous truths of the plan of salvation in their logical connection; of distinguishing the food of the soul from the flights of fancy: they will become no mean judges of what a minister ought to be, and what their own spiritual necessities demand. Now, in order to satisfy the wants of men, thus

intellectually and morally conditioned, the preacher must be, not only an eloquent and a pious man—he must be a theologian. He must understand not only the doctrines of the Bible in detail, or in their historical connection in the Bible—he must understand the relations which they sustain to each other and to the great centre of the christian system, Jesus Christ our Lord. He must understand and be able to trace the influence of doctrine, not only upon the inner life of the soul, in awakening and directing the affections, but also upon the outer man, in their influence upon the developement of conduct. Then, and then only, will he be prepared rightly to divide the word of God and give unto each his portion in due season.

We frankly admit the fact, that theology, as a science, has made little or no progress in the Lutheran church in this country, and particularly that form of it which is found in the symbolical books of the church. This admission is made with no agreeable feelings, and it is intended to prepare the way for the remedy of this evil, by directing attention to its source. We have pointed to the want of education in the church as the great cause. This will be manifest when we consider that there is a reflex and reciprocal influence exerted upon each other by the people and the ministry. An educated people will require a thoroughly educated ministry, and from these will arise the theologians and writers of the church. Where the people are imperfectly educated, the inference is at once made and most erroneously, that they require a ministry of very little mental training or theological knowledge. The consequence will be that men will be admitted into the ministry, licensed and sent forth by the Synods, who are in no sense qualified, with the exception of personal piety. They are filling up stones, it is said by the more intelligent, and in a large edifice such are always needed, and, indeed, are indispensable; the less intelligent will receive them as worthy members of the sacred brotherhood. The influence of such a ministry again upon the people is, to continue them in their ignorance. They have no just appreciation of the importance of education among the people. If its power is understood and sometimes felt, it is referred to pride or ambition. Such ministers afford very little encouragement to their people to educate their children. In schools and colleges they take no interest, at least they put forth no active efforts to call them into existence and to sustain them. The consequence is, that as few are educated, there are but few to enter the ministry. The church remains destitute, and the motive to receive into the sacred office an increased number of but

partially educated men becomes stronger. Hence, too, if Institutions for theological education are established, they will be very likely to be modelled according to these ideas or brought under their influence. A very limited amount of education will be considered sufficient, the mode of study will be superficial, the mental discipline next to nothing, and the whole course lame and inadequate to the purposes for which it is designed. At the same time, some of the most important parts of theology will be almost ignored by incompetency in the teacher to communicate, or in the student to receive.

In such a state of things, theology cannot develope itself, and, what seems to us of more importance, the active charities, the benevolent operations of the church suffer. The onward movement of Christianity is retarded, Christ is wounded in the house of his friends, and the apathy which grows out of ignorance and sin covers the church. The Pilgrims of New England pursued a different course. With the Church they built the School-house, the Academy and the College. The ministry grew out of the people, intelligent, as well as pious. The Theological Seminary, first engrafted upon the College or University, formed with it a necessary connection in the production of a ministry pious, talented and learned, and a people active and enterprising, not only in the ordinary business of life, but in the more important interests of the church and of eternity. Here may be witnessed the reflex and reciprocal influence of ministers and people in the developement of theology, in the dissemination of knowledge, in the calling forth of a numerous and intelligent ministry, and in the exercise of the active charities of life, even to the sending of the living ministry, with the everlasting Gospel, to the ends of the earth. What is required of us, then, who so much resemble our Congregational brethren in the general features of our church government, is, to imitate them in their schools and Colleges. The ministry must raise the people, and the people will sustain the ministry. On this subject we should preach and pray and labor. The church in its length and breadth should understand its importance. Parents should be led to feel that it is their duty to educate the minds and hearts of their children, much more than it is to discipline their bodies to labor. Individuals and families should learn on this subject to be disinterested, and to see in the education of their children an influence growing up, which is to move the church and the world. "None of us liveth to himself and no man dieth to himself, for whether we live, we live unto the Lord, and

whether we die we die unto the Lord; whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's." To what other cause than a criminal neglect on the subject of education are we to refer the fact, that there are preparing for the ministry, in the Presbyterian church, O. S., at least four hundred beneficiaries, and in the other division of that church, perhaps as many, and in the congregational churches many more, whilst in our church, with a membership as large as any one of them, there are not fifty! It is the want of primary education; and I would have this truth sounded through the church in its length and breadth, with the voice of a trumpet: it is the want of education among the people. As it was this which lay in the way of the fathers of the church, a stumbling block, arresting the progress of the church in her wanderings through the wilderness, and presenting an impassable obstacle to her onward march and improvement, so is it now, an incubus on her energies, in every department of active christianity and in all parts of the church. We have yet to hear that one Academy, or one College has been fully endowed by the church. We have yet to learn that the importance of a College to the church has been appreciated, even in a small measure, by a tithe of our community. Popular movements and legislative enactments have effected something, but the church, as such, has accomplished comparatively nothing. Of the thirty-two Synods bearing the Lutheran name, there stand forth, as distinguished in this respect, the Synods of Pittsburg, Ohio, Virginia, and South Carolina. The former, though but lately organized, has formed and is sustaining an efficient Academy, which promises much for the future. South Carolina will soon endow her Literary Institute, if we may reason from present appearances; Virginia has her Institute in active operation; and Ohio, with at least four Synods, will surely sustain one College?

Why cannot the Synods in our connection unite and endow Colleges, as the Presbyterians have done, and the Methodists by Conference districts, and the Congregationalists by their Consociations? If ever such an effort was needed in the church, it is now. If ever associations for this purpose are desirable, and contributions to this object will be productive of extensive good, it is now. It is the age of activity and enterprize, and, if we permit our hands to hang down and our knees to become feeble, we shall be swept away by the rush of sister denominations hastening forward to the performance of that work and the occupation of those fields which belong to us, but which we so criminally neglect. We live

in an age of the world distinguished above all others for its profound erudition, for its numerous and astonishing discoveries in science, and inventions in the arts, for its zeal and liberality in religion and education. To be supine and indifferent under such circumstances, is resisting the spirit of the age, and is not unlike sinning against the convictions of conscience and the clear light of the Gospel. One important consequence of the want of general education among the people, is the great disproportion in numbers, which the ministers sustain to the members of the church. From the time of the planting of the church in this country until the present, this has been a serious ground of complaint. Our ministers are very much in the condition of the itinerancy of the Methodist church, so far as labor is concerned, with none of the advantages of that system. Their pastoral charge generally extends to four, very often to six, and sometimes to eight or ten congregations. In consequence of this destitution of ministers, our church may be regarded as missionary ground, in which each minister is an itinerant, and in the saddle almost every day of the week. With such a pastoral care, with so many souls looking to him for spiritual instruction, and the number constantly increasing, the most talented and learned man, who would be faithful, could find but little time for study. How is it possible, under such disadvantages, for theological literature to grow among us? Literature of any description is the result not only of thorough education, but also of leisure and retirement. This is true in an eminent degree of theology. Where the minister of the Gospel has charge of a small parish, and addresses an intelligent auditory, he possesses the leisure and the motive to study each subject thoroughly, and to throw it into that form in which it will be permanent. Some of the most profound theological productions of the continent of Europe and of this country, are the fruits of the labor of men placed in circumstances similar to those just indicated. But in the Lutheran church in this country it is not unusual for the minister to preach five or six sermons in the week, during a large part of the year, and, in addition to attend to those pastoral duties, which, under the circumstances, he is able to perform. The evil which is here referred to, and which stands prominently in the way of progress in theological learning and literature, is perpetuated both by the ordinary increase of the church and by the tide of emigration from Europe, which becomes broader and deeper every year. In addition to the disproportionate strength of the ministry to the field which they are required to cultivate, there should be mentioned

the difficulty of preaching in two widely different languages. The acquisition of several languages, for the purpose of studying their literature and being enriched by their treasures, is comparatively an easy attainment, but to be prepared to preach with acceptance in two languages fundamentally unlike, is an achievement not often performed. Nine-tenths of our ministry are burdened with this difficulty. The church has just commenced the period of transition from her native, unrivalled language to that of the land of her adoption; and this period, judging from the convulsions which are agitating Europe to the very depths of her political and religious life, will not soon reach its close. From these facts, we are prepared to infer that the influence of the ministry and the people, thus far, has contributed little or nothing towards the advancement of theological literature in the church.

We proceed to consider the influence of our Theological Seminaries on the subject under consideration: The first thing which attracts our attention is their number. Seven theological Seminaries would seem, at once, entirely disproportionate to the number of Academies and Colleges in the church, as well as the actual necessities of the case. The Presbyterian church in both branches, sustains only eleven, but then it has under its control at least forty Colleges and many more Academies. We frankly admit that this quantity is *prima facie* evidence against the quality of our Seminaries. This strikes us as the more remarkable, inasmuch as they do not contain fifty students, all told. One Seminary would have been more than adequate for the training of all the theological students, and as many more as have grown up in the church, from her planting in this country until now. We are aware of the views entertained by those who favor the multiplication of these schools of the prophets, for the local benefits which they confer. But, with all due respect for their motives, we have never been able to understand why theological students, educated at a distance from their native places, would not return and settle among their friends, if their services were needed, as readily as to wander off and locate among strangers. Ministers, possessing the spirit of their master, will settle where they believe they can be most useful, and there, their friends, and the church at large, should desire them to settle. In this respect the Lutheran church, with but one theological Seminary, would have been precisely in the condition of the Presbyterian and Congregational churches, whose pulpits, for many years, were supplied with an able ministry from Princeton and Andover. We cannot understand

why Hartwick, with its many advantages, might not have sent forth into the Lutheran church all her ministers up to this time, educated there as thoroughly as they could be educated elsewhere. The same may be asserted of almost any other Seminary or location.

The direct consequence of the multiplication of theological schools among us, has been to tax the church heavily, and to prevent thorough training. As to the first particular, I have already asserted that not one of our Seminaries is fully endowed. Hartwick, Gettysburg and Lexington, have each one professorship secured. This has been effected at a cost of at least one hundred and fifty thousand dollars to the church. If, for the sake of avoiding the charge of exaggeration, we reduce the sum one-fourth, we have the church taxed to the amount of one hundred thousand dollars to educate annually about twenty-five students. We regard the assertion within the limits of truth, that the three Institutions designated, have not, in all, averaged more than twenty-five theological students annually. The tuition fees alone of these students would be four thousand five hundred dollars, equal to one hundred and eighty dollars each for the year. Now this expenditure might be borne, even if the number of students were less, provided the instruction were adequate. But here we hesitate not to assert, that there is, and from the nature of the case there must be, great deficiency, not from any want of capacity or fidelity on the part of the instructors, but from the peculiar position which they occupy. Where there is but one professor to give instruction, as is unfortunately the case in all our Seminaries, except one, the instruction, which is ordinarily distributed among three, devolves upon him alone. One man, even if he be an intellectual giant, cannot perform the work of three, and therefore the instruction must be deficient. Systematic theology alone is sufficient to engross all the time and attention of one man: and how, then, can he, in addition, teach Exegesis and Church History with their affiliated subjects? Besides, in most of our Seminaries, the Professors of Theology are expected to give instruction also in studies preparatory to theology, and to preach every Sabbath, so that they are disabled almost as much as pastors burdened with the labor of a large pastoral charge, who, in addition, give instruction to students in theology. Now, if all these theological schools were merged into one, which would be quite adequate to the existing wants of the church, or into two, for the sake of convenience of location, and the funds, which do not accomplish the end contemplated by reason of

their dispersion, were concentrated upon these, then might we hope that the professors, furnished with adequate support, and in the enjoyment of sufficient leisure, would not only train their students thoroughly in the various subjects connected with theological education, but would also directly contribute to the advancement of theological literature. We cannot but regret that at least five of the seven theological schools are not high schools or Colleges, furnishing nothing more than a preparatory education. We regret it, for the sake of our church in particular, and the cause of Christ in general. If our Synods would direct their attention to the endowment and support of Academies and Colleges, manifesting a lively interest in their progress, and sustaining them with their prayer and active coöperation, it would not be long until we would have the number of our theological students doubled, and their qualifications for the ministry greatly increased. As we have already intimated, the tendency of the existing state of things is towards a want of thoroughness in training, which, as long as it continues, will be a stumbling-block in the way of theological development. Besides, when Theological Seminaries are multiplied beyond the educated materials of the Church, there will always be a temptation to receive students who do not possess adequate preparatory knowledge. Numbers are necessary to justify the existence and continuance of such an Institution, and therefore numbers must be secured at all hazards. The effect of this upon young men looking forward to the ministry, is to make them indifferent to a thorough preparatory training; the standard of ministerial education is lowered, the study of theology, that science of sciences, will be finally looked upon as of little importance—the candidate for the ministry will suppose that he can read at home, or with his pastor, and go at once from the merely literary Institution into the ministry; or, if he is too intelligent to do this, his respect for the church in which he was reared is undermined, and he resorts to the better organized Institutions of other churches, there to have his sympathy with the doctrines and operations of his own church, to say the least, greatly impaired. Who can doubt that in this way the church suffers in her vital interests? That this has been the tendency of things in our church in this country, can not be denied. After a young man has thus passed through a Theological Seminary, and bears with him a certificate testifying that he has attended to the ordinary studies of the Institution, it is not difficult for him to gain admission into one of our Synods, and obtain from it licensure and ordi-

nation. Thus the influence of our theological schools, unless they are based upon and conducted in accordance with the elevated standard of preparatory and theological education which is demanded by the spirit of the age, is opposed to progress in theological literature.

Concerning the doctrinal basis which is assumed in our theological instruction, we fear that in our zeal for the truth we have pursued the two extremes to the neglect of the safe and wholesome mean. One class of our theologians are represented as pursuing orthodoxy so far as to supersede the Bible by our symbolical authorities and the works of Luther; others abandoning the ancient landmarks, are regarded as floating through the regions of theological space, "without a local habitation or a name." We fear, however, that the old orthodox divines of the Lutheran church are but little read by our students of divinity, either in the schools or out of them. Much better would it be to have their minds trained by studying Chemnitz, Hollaz, Calov and Gerhard, than to spend their time in making compends of facts and results, which they have never elaborated, and which therefore can never be called their own. No one, we presume, will deny that our theological students should be directed to those sources whence they may obtain a full and satisfactory acquaintance with the doctrines of the church, not only as held now, in this and other countries, but especially what our fathers believed, when under the influence of truth they became a distinct ecclesiastical organization and maintained their position against the force of argument and the power of the secular arm. We regard our symbolical books, especially, as admirably calculated to teach at the same time correct views in theology, and to foster sincere piety. To neglect them in a Lutheran Theological school, is criminal, to reject them, is to abandon the faith of our fathers and the distinctive doctrines of the church. We prize them because of their historical and biblical character, throwing us back at once amidst the stirring scenes of the Reformation, and exhibiting to us those truths drawn from the word of God, which were mighty to the pulling down of the strong holds of Satan. This seems to have been the view of the General Synod in the establishment of their Seminary at Gettysburg: for the first Resolution made by them on that subject, declares that "in it shall be taught the fundamental doctrines of the sacred Scriptures as contained in the Augsburg Confession"; and the Professor of Didactic Theology is required to declare solemnly in the presence of God, that he believes the Augsburg Confession and the Cate-

chism of Luther to be a summary and just exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the word of God," and he obligates himself to teach nothing "either directly or by insinuation which shall contradict or be inconsistent" with the doctrines which they contain.—(See Constitution of Theological Seminary, pp. 3–10.) But whilst we express our veneration for these symbols, and give them their proper place in the theological instruction of the church, we would not have them taught, as Spener states they were taught in the German Universities, before the establishment of the school at Halle, in 1694, when five or six years were spent in studying these symbols to the exclusion of the word of God, and when Exegesis, which is the only proper foundation of theology, though taught by ripe scholars, could not be sustained. The Holy Scriptures are the prime source whence we must derive our religious knowledge, and we would receive and honor the symbols only because by investigation and experience, we discover that they contain the unadulterated truths of the Bible. With Spener and Francke, we would understand the literal sense of God's word by grammatical and historical interpretation, and, comparing the symbol with the word, receive its doctrines because they are contained in the word thus ascertained. These symbols we would use, then, not as bones of contention around which polemics should stand, and snarl, and wage a perpetual warfare of words, but as the Bible should be used by the learned and unlearned, for the obtaining of clear views, and to promote holiness of heart and life. As an exegetical knowledge of the word of God is the only possible foundation of revealed theology, our Seminaries will contribute but little to the advancement of scriptural theology, unless the word of God is explained from its original languages on sound hermeneutical principles. No man can be satisfied that his knowledge is real, unless it is obtained in this way. He may indeed take for granted what he hears, without examination, and he may hear only the truth, yet how does he know it? How can the ingenuous mind be satisfied with hearsay evidence, when he enjoys the privilege of seeing and knowing for himself? How can he linger at the streams, more or less polluted, when the springs are gushing forth in original freshness all around him? The progress of theology among us will depend upon the fact whether our students of theology are prepared to study the Scriptures in their original tongues, and whether our Seminaries furnish the facilities which are necessary for the thorough exegetical study of the word. These remarks are made, in reference to this subject in particular,

because there is a tendency in certain directions to undervalue it in a course of theological training, and to neglect it on account of the time which is required in preparatory education, in order to make any attainment in it; and because it is not known to many that practical piety and freedom of opinion in religion have their proper home in the exegetical study of the Bible, and necessarily grow out of it.

We cannot close our remarks on the general subject of theological education, in our church, without referring to the influence of the Synods as such. They possess the power of licensing and ordaining to the sacred office, and therefore the ultimate decision of ministerial qualification is vested in them. They have the power to control the instruction of the theological schools indirectly, and to determine whether the standard of attainment shall be elevated or depressed. That there has been a general tendency upwards, during the last ten years, must be apparent to a casual observer. That it is not proportioned to the upward tendency of the masses, is also undeniable. The chief cause is one which cannot but affect every pious heart, viz.: the great and increasing spiritual destitution of the church. Annual appeals, of the most touching nature, are addressed to the Synods, for ministerial aid. Congregations organized and willing to support pastors, and multitudes unorganized, wandering like sheep without a shepherd, do not appeal in vain to the sympathies of the christian heart. Our Synods, under the influence of such appeals, have too often introduced into the ministry men of slender abilities and limited attainments. The immediate effect was good, in supplying for a time the wants of the destitute. The ultimate effect, in nearly every case, will be found to be unfavorable to the highest interests of spiritual christianity. Where the minister falls below the educated portion of the community in literary attainments, though he be a pious man, the interests of christianity, and especially of the church with which he is connected, must necessarily suffer. Of this fact it will not be difficult to furnish many witnesses. Such a course of procedure might be pardonable, and may be, in some respects, commendable, when it is impossible or difficult to procure well-qualified ministers of the Gospel, and therefore we will rather praise than censure the past. Now, however such motives are fast losing their force. There is no difficulty in securing the services of any number of laborers, and we have both the ability and the facilities to educate them thoroughly. The church possesses abundant resources. Pious young men of good natural abilities, but deficient in means, are anxious

to study for the ministry. Almost any number of such can be obtained. All that is required, then, in order to secure the kind and the number of men called for by the necessities of the church, is for the Synods individually, if they cannot collectively, to sustain the educational operations of the church now in existence, and send into our schools all the sons of the church who ought to be in a course of training in them. Let our ministers stir up our wealthy parents to educate their sons, and let the Synods declare that no young man of suitable qualifications, who makes application for aid in his preparation for the ministry, shall be rejected, and soon will the halls of our Colleges and Seminaries be crowded with candidates who may there, in due time, be "thoroughly furnished unto every good work." B.

ARTICLE III.

THE GOSPEL IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Remarks on Romans 1: 2. ["Which he had promised afore (i. e. the Gospel which he formerly declared) by his prophets in the holy Scriptures."]

Translated from the German of Dr. F. W. C. Unbreit,* by Rev. Charles F. Schneffer, A. M., Red Hook, Dutchess Co., N. Y.

WHEN the Apostle asserts in this passage that the Gospel had been formerly declared by the Prophets of God in the holy Scriptures, he maintains, distinctly and unequivocally, that an indissoluble connection exists between the Old and the New Testaments. The important task is now assigned to theological science, of ascertaining, both the prophecy in the Old Testament to which allusion is made, and its actual fulfilment in the New Testament. In illustrating our position that the Gospel is in the Old Testament, we shall endeavor to condense, as far as possible, the results which are furnished by our Commentary on the Prophets,¹ to which we refer the reader for the fuller development and confirmation of the details.

* Theologische Studien und Kritiken; Jahrgang, 1849, Erstes Heft.

¹ Praktischer Commentar über d. Proph. des A. B. Vol. I. Isaiah. 1841. Vol. II. Jeremiah. 1842.—TR.

It is generally admitted that the Prophets of the Old Testament entertained a profound conviction of the future consummation of the kingdom of God through a Mediator who would appear on earth; but, whether this consummation is the *εὐαγγέλιον* (Gospel), and whether the Messiah whose appearance was promised, is the Christian Messiah, are two points which are denied even by many Christian interpreters, of whom some, after stating the most favorable view which they take of the case, concede, merely, that certain Christian elements exist in the prophecies. We maintain, on the contrary, that the *Χριστός* (Christ) of the Old Testament is the *Ἰησοῦς* (Jesus) of the New Testament, and, that the law of his kingdom is not the old *νόμος* (law) merely in an improved form, but one that is entirely new, namely, the *εὐαγγέλιον* (gospel), so that the Apostle could appeal, with the strictest propriety and truth, to the former declarations of the Prophets in reference to this subject.

When we carefully examine the peculiar features of our internal or moral nature, we become conscious of the existence in ourselves, individually, of two personalities, if we may be permitted to employ this phraseology; one of these, the higher, far transcends the other, or lower, personality: in its seeming inaccessibility, it belongs to the future, and it is not represented or set forth in the realities of our *present* thoughts, volitions, and actions. This disagreement necessarily acquired unusual prominence in those who lived under the old covenant, to whom God revealed himself in that impressive declaration: "Ye shall be holy for I am holy," (Lev. 11: 45), and to whom he gave the command: "Thou *shalt love* the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." (Deut. 6: 5). In an age as early as that of the patriarchs, this consciousness of the diversity existing between two persons in one individual is made apparent by the prophetic Spirit who hovers over the historic narrative. That Abraham, in whom all the families of the earth shall be blessed, (Gen. 12: 3) is not the same man who declares that his wife is his sister, (Gen. 12: 19. 20: 2) in order to avert danger from himself at the court of Pharaoh or Abimelech. This two-fold personality, nay, this sundering of the same individual, is still more distinctly exhibited in the *name* (to which reference has already been made in this periodical, Stud. u. Krit. 1848. H. 1), of that ancestor who gave to his descendants their most prominent appellation: *Israel* is distinguished from *Jacob* with great precision; it is only at a future day that the *true* Israel shall appear, namely, as

Jehovah's "servant," of whom a description is given in the concluding chapters of Isaiah, ch. XL—LXVI. The same difference between two persons in one individual cannot fail to be recognized in *Moses* also. He who gave the command: "Thou shalt not kill," (Exod. 20: 13) is not the same man who slew the Egyptian in his anger, (Exod. 1: 12). If even an author posterior to him really wrote the words which he represents *Moses* as using: "The Lord thy God will raise up a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken," (Deut. 18: 15)—they still exhibit, in their spirit, both the advancing culture of the mind and character of *Moses*, and the progress which he made in employing means for educating his people.

The most striking and important example, however, of this difference between two personalities in the same individual, occurs in the case of King David, who gave distinctness and strength to the Messianic hope of the ancient Jew. Precisely as in the historic narrative, on the one hand, his higher and his lower *man* (*Mensch*) are repeatedly disunited, so that they even assume a hostile attitude towards each other in the instances of his adultery with Bathsheba, and of the terrible letter which he "sent by the hand of Uriah," (2 Sam. 11: 14) even so, on the other hand, in that image of his higher life, we mean his sacred poetry, which seems to encircle his head like an imperishable crown, we see most plainly his own consciousness of this two-fold character of his being. This consciousness he derived from his own deep knowledge and convictions of sin, and from his fervent piety. Indeed, the fifty-first Psalm is like a mirror which reflects all the peculiar features of his being. Even after the critic has, on other grounds,¹ stated all his objections against the Davidic genuineness of this Psalm, he will still be compelled to concede to

¹ [The language of the last two verses, Ps. 51: 18, 19, "build thou the walls of Jerusalem," &c., deprives the inscription: "a Psalm of David," &c. of all historic value, in the eyes of H. E. G. Paulus, De Wette, and others, as it seems to them to imply that the city and temple lay in ruins, and to contain a prayer for their restoration; hence they infer that the psalm must have been composed during the Captivity, by a Poet whose name is lost. But the terms are susceptible of an interpretation in strict accordance both with the profound sorrow which David experienced for the crime committed by him, and with his natural fears that, by having forfeited his claims to the fulfilment of the Divine promises, the walls of Jerusalem should not be built, that is, that the structures which he contemplated or had commenced, would not be completed, and that the strength and stability of the city would not be maintained. Rosenmüller, *ad. loc.* quotes an opinion to which Aben Ezra assigns great weight, the substance of which is, that a pious and well-meaning captive in Babylon, may have added the two suspected verses, for the purpose of adapting the whole psalm to the situation of his afflicted peo-

the advocate of its Davidic origin, that, if the sentiments which it expresses are recognized as a criterion, no other name could have been more appropriately prefixed to the poem, than that name which is actually given. The Davidic origin of the thirty-second psalm may, possibly, be acknowledged with even less hesitation than that of the fifty-first, to which it bears a strong affinity. But, whatever views may be held on this subject, it cannot be denied, that the plain and simple result of even the most superficial interpretation of the Davidic poems will coincide with the proposition which we have just advanced, and the recognition of the truth which only is important at present, namely, David's own consciousness of the distinction between a lower and a more elevated personality in himself.

While, then, David unhesitatingly and firmly believes in the stability and perpetual duration of the throne which he received from God through Samuel the prophet, still, guided by his unaffected humility, and his consciousness of his legal and moral defects, he very distinctly perceives that he himself does not constitute the *Ideal of the Lord's Anointed*. He is as fully convinced that the divinely established kingdom, which was founded on earth, will also attain to a historical consummation on earth, nay, even in Jerusalem where it originated, as he is convinced that the decree according to which God will, through Israel, redeem all nations from the bondage of falsehood and sin, forms one complete whole, and will be executed. In consequence of such expectations, on the one hand, and of a deep sense of his own inferiority, on the other, a firm persuasion that, at a certain future day, the *true* David, the perfect Messiah, will occupy his throne, becomes necessary to his faith and mode of thought. It is here unnecessary to decide the subordinate question whether David, further, supposed that this distant descendant would be an earthly king like himself, since it does not involve the main fact, that David certainly regarded himself, in his own person, as a type of the Messiah. Unless we admit this last point, many of his psalms, like the twenty-second, to which so much importance is attached, become unintelligible. Indeed, this typical system of David, influenced other sacred poets,

ple. This view Venema is inclined to adopt, and Rosenmüller himself arrives at the same conclusion. It is scarcely necessary to add, that this procedure, which would render any difficult passage liable to the charge of being an interpolation, is sustained by no higher authority than the conjectures of critics, and is not, we believe, prompted by any suspicious features in the existing manuscripts or ancient versions.—TR.

one of whom affords an illustration in the seventy-second psalm, in which the future Solomon is glorified in the person of the reigning king. The "last words of David," 2 Sam. 23: 2 sqq. are very remarkable. In these the king disjoins his personality as a type of the Messiah, if we may use the language, from his personality as a human being placed in certain relations of life, and assigns to the former an external position, so that, sustaining now the character of a prophet alone, he pronounces a direct prophecy respecting the *just ruler* who will appear among men at a future day.

The views which we have here developed, enable us to find in David himself, especially, and in the Psalms generally, a historical guide to the interpretation of the Messianic predictions of the prophets, when we design to give them an appropriate historico-theocratic explanation. As the prophets, in the more restricted sense of the appellation, originated in regal, sacerdotal and popular relations and circumstances that did not correspond to an absolute theocratic Idealism, and as they were not kings themselves, it follows, that in their Messianic predictions, the typical character of the king receded from their view, and, sometimes, entirely disappeared. In the first place, they regarded the Messiah as a strictly defined and purely objective personality, distinct from them and their peculiar station. For, while we admit that, at times, a prophet may have adopted a reigning king as a typical substratum of his predictions, as in the case of the prophet Isaiah and king Hezekiah, still, in the largest portion of their Messianic predictions, they certainly omit all imagery borrowed from the reigning king, and, in a direct manner, describe the son of David. In the next place, the prophet, adopting a course analogous to that of king David, regards *himself* as a type, in his capacity of a prophet. He is, to be sure, guided to this course by that moral elevation above the people, the king and the priest, to which his office as a prophet of the truth has raised him, but, at the same time, he recognizes his own vast inferiority to the Ideal of HIM who is perfectly righteous. He is, in this manner, taught to discover the real and true prophet only in one who is yet to come, and whose personality, blended with that of the king as well as of the high-priest, appears, at length, before him, in one distinct image. In reference so the high-priest, it may be added, that, while he is a symbolical reflection of the holy people in his representative character, still, the difference between himself as an individual and the full realization of purity, is sufficiently indicated by the obligation which was imposed upon him to

bring a sin-offering for himself and for his house, on the great day of atonement, (Lev. 16: 6).

The three highest official personages known in Jewish history, the king, the high-priest, and the prophet, furnish, then, a compound image of a Mediator who governs the people, and guides them to the highest blessedness: but, above this image hovers the spiritually glorified form of a moral and religious Redeemer, who delivers all nations from sin and death, and who, "beginning at Jerusalem," (Luke 24: 47) establishes on earth a universal kingdom of truth, righteousness and love, which perpetually enlarges itself and shall endure forever. Let us now take the New Testament as our place of observation or stand-point, and thus survey the coming of the Messiah, who appears in colors of light as he emerges from the restrictions which the influence of local and popular usages had thrown around him; then, in the face of this *Χριστός* (Christ) we cannot fail to recognize the pure and perfect features of the *Ἰησοῦς* (Jesus). We need not tarry to discuss the question, whether, in the case of one or more of the prophets, a fainter or a deeper popular and Israelitic shade may not dim this spotless theanthropic image; we may even concede that while individual Seers are delineating this exalted and magnificent image, the lights and shades occasionally struggle for the mastery, of which their descriptions of the Messianic kingdom may, possibly, afford the best illustrations. For even when the prophets discharge their highest duties, they retain the peculiar and essential features of the human character; they are called forth, animated, and enlightened by the Spirit of God, whose communications are truly and really imparted, in a peculiar manner indeed, but still in harmony with the natural operations of the human mind. We cannot, therefore, give too much prominence to the observation, that our views should be directed exclusively to *that* image, the lineaments of which are derived from the spirit of the Messianic prophecies, in a region above which we see it soaring, and it is this image which, in the most decisive manner, we term the *Christian* Messiah.

Let us, first of all, recollect, that the promised *Lord's anointed*, is not only a king belonging to the family of David, but also a priest and a prophet. When we examine the image of the Messiah, primarily, as a king, it exhibits no features characteristic of a military hero, or of a political ruler, and it is worthy of observation that, when the prophets announce a deliverance of the people from the power of another nation, they never distinctly assign this work to the Messiah, but to

God himself. We find the most striking illustration in Isaiah, ch. 40 — 66; here, Cyrus, a stranger, is called the Messiah¹ of God, (ch. 45 : 1) by whom Israel shall be delivered from Chaldaean bondage, while it is the "servant" of God to whom the people are to be indebted for moral and spiritual liberty. Indeed, the two celebrated predictions of Isaiah, in the ninth and eleventh chapters, are sufficient to demonstrate, that in the prophetic delineation of the Messianic image, the political and military features of a hero are by no means visible, but, on the contrary, the moral and religious character of the king predominates, or rather exclusively appears. The promised child, (Isaiah 9 : 6) upon whose shoulder the government shall be, is furnished with names, which, as special predicates of his being, express his theanthropic nature; he is preëminently styled the *Prince of Peace*, who establishes and extends his kingdom forever, not with weapons of war, but with judgment and with justice, as an everlasting Father of love. While the Spirit of God rests upon him, (ch. 11 : 2) that is, takes perpetual and uncontrolled possession of him, and exalts to the highest degree the several scriptural gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and might, of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord, he becomes, when thus endowed, a judge who searches the heart, and examines its most hidden recesses with an eye and an ear that cannot be deceived, always scrutinizing and discovering the religious source of every sentiment and act. Further, he protects the poor and suffering, and, clothed with the girdle of truth and righteousness, but not with the sword, he punishes the wicked, smiting them with the rod of his mouth, and slaying them with the breath of his lips; verse 4. In answer to the objection against this representation of a spiritual king of truth, righteousness and love, that, in the mind of Isaiah, the promised Messiah is literally, a king, since it is said of the latter that he sits upon the throne of David, (verse 7,) we claim that it is by no means certain that this expression is not to be figuratively understood, precisely as Christ spoke of himself as a king; indeed, we may derive an additional reason for adopting the opinion that the word is used figuratively, from the fact that we are not able to form the least conception of a literal ruler, who can be called the "everlasting Father," and who establishes a perpetual and ever extending kingdom—we are, naturally, led then to ask : who shall govern it when the Messiah

¹ For some additional remarks upon the scriptural use of the term "Messiah," see note by the Translator at the end of this article.—ED.

dies? Nevertheless, these difficulties cannot embarrass us, provided that we maintain the christological position which we have already defined, and we might even admit, although we do not desire to be understood as making the concession, that Isaiah, in his Messianic predictions, was not altogether disembarassed from the idea of a literal king.

We prefer, however, to refute the objection to which we have alluded, by a reference to the view which has already been advanced and established, namely, that the destruction of the temple of Solomon, and the fall of the old Davidic kingdom, when the Captivity commenced, constituted an epoch in the history of the Theocracy, from which we are to date an entire change of the *idea* of the Messiah which had previously existed. It is precisely in this respect, that the free and energetic Jeremiah, who is the first with whom we meet in this new period, and who foretells the future amid the ruins of Jerusalem, is not fully appreciated. How significant is the declaration, (Jerem. 3: 16) that the days shall come in which the ark of the covenant shall not come to mind, neither be remembered, and in which no other one will be made, seeing that there will be a new world of the new covenant, such as had not been made with the fathers! The new ark of the covenant is the human breast, and the table is the heart, in which the law shall be written by the finger of God; then shall the outward religion of the law become an inward religion of faith. The fundamental doctrine of the new covenant is the doctrine of God's forgiveness of sin, and the new congregation shall not be divided into the two classes of priests and laymen, but all shall be equal in their knowledge of God, from the least unto the greatest. (Jere. 31: 31-34). The Mediator of this new covenant, a branch of David, bears the expressive name: "The Lord our Righteousness;" (Jerem. 23: 5, 6), he is that most noble one, (אֲדֹנָי) proceeding, as a governor from the midst of the people,—consequently, not the immediate successor of the king—whom God will cause to draw near, that he may approach unto him; "for who is this that engaged his heart to approach unto me?" (Jerem. 30: 21). Does not the king here become a high-priest of purity, who, interceding and purifying, alone has access to the Holy One, because there is no one among men like unto him, that would thus appear before God in truth, not in an external and symbolical manner, but inwardly, with an entire surrender of the heart? And thus, without having instituted an inquiry, we have really found the true Melchizedek of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the type of whom is

found in Psalm 110: 4,—the messenger of the covenant, whom the people sought, after the rebuilding of the temple in the time of Zerubbabel—the Lord, who shall suddenly come to his temple—the Judge, before whom, when he appeareth, none shall stand. (Malachi 3: 1–3). He is the Branch, “from under whom it shall branch up” (Zech. 6: 12, 13 [English marginal version]), who shall build the true temple of the Lord, adorned with the double crown of the royal and sacerdotal office, and terminating the protracted contest between the church and state.

Before, however, we advert to this spiritual and glorified image of the Messiah in the writings of the later prophets, after the laborious restoration of the state under Zerubbabel and Joshua, (Ez. 3: 2, Haggai 1: 1, 12, 14) let us retrace our steps, till we regain the period of the Captivity; and let us address our inquiries respecting the Messiah to Ezekiel, that wonderful prophet, who, in the spirit, builds on the banks of the river of Chebar only an ideal and symbolic temple, from the midst of which flow the holy waters of the word of God, cleansing and vivifying the dead sea of the sin of his people, and penetrating even the ocean of heathenism, (ch. 47: 1–12). Ezekiel describes the Messiah as the shepherd who brings again that which was lost, who, like a new David, a servant of God, is the mediator of a new covenant, in which God will give to his people a new heart and a new spirit, and take away the stony heart out of their flesh, and give them an heart of flesh. (Ezek. 11: 19). The prominence which is given to these two names of “shepherd” and “servant of God,” (ch. 34: 23, &c.) in their application to the Messiah, leads us to a more particular consideration of his third, that is, his prophetic office. The prophets are, indeed, termed shepherds by Ezekiel, and, in the concluding chapters of Isaiah, (ch. 40—ch. 66) the prophet is styled, by way of eminence, the guide and teacher of the people; and the servant of God. In this remarkable division of the writings of Isaiah, which is the clearest and most decidedly Christian portion of the Old Testament, it is true that the prophet, while speaking of himself and announcing new heavens and a new earth, does represent himself and his associate, the servant of God, as the mediator of this new covenant of the future, and as the light of the new law for the appearance of which the most remote nations of the earth are waiting; nevertheless, in the delineation of the future Redeemer, he so completely passes beyond his own narrow sphere, that the image which he, at last, presents, becomes identical with that of the Messiah, with this modification,

that, by exalting this conception to the highest spiritual perfection, the Χριστός, (Christ) according to him, becomes really and perfectly the Ἰησοῦς (Jesus) of the New Testament. He is well aware, it is true, that the name of *David* is appropriated to the Messiah, and terms him, in this relation, a leader and commander, and, preëminently, a witness to the people, (Isaiah 55: 3-5); still, he merges the name of "king" in that of "servant of God," precisely as in Ezek. 34: 23, 24, the latter name is applied both to the former historic David, and to the future Messianic David. This is the appropriate and significant name of him whose self-sacrificing and overflowing love, while fulfilling the will of the true God of grace, executed the decree of redemption which, in and through Israel, should bring salvation to all nations; and it is the name by which, in the widest sense, the prophet comprehends the whole body of Jews who had remained pure and faithful, in Chaldæa, the land of idolatry, but by which, in a more restricted sense, he designates those prophets who had been public and fearless witnesses of the truth, who, in the service of the divine word, had innocently suffered in the presence of the world and through the world, yea, who had died in place of the guilty, and precisely on that account had been glorified by God.

But these prophets, even in their highest future glorification through their doctrines, their sufferings and their vicarious death, are nevertheless, in the view of Isaiah, merely a type of the promised Messiah, the true servant of God. He it is, who does not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax, but raises up the bowed down sinner with the promise of the pardoning love of God, who, being a light of the Gentiles as well of the Jews, opens the blind eyes and brings out the prisoners from the prison, (Isaiah 42: 7), and who, as the physician of the sick, invites the poor and heavy-laden, and gives them rest; it is he who, though he had done no violence, (53: 9) and though there was no deceit in his mouth, was yet despised and rejected, but who also, as one that suffered innocently, took on himself the sin and punishment of the guilty, meekly and patiently, not opening his mouth to complain; it is he who, making intercession for the transgressors, poured out his own soul unto death, in order that he, the righteous servant, might justify and reconcile many; and it is he who, on account of the humiliation to which he voluntarily yielded, shall be raised unto splendor and glory, and, having victoriously finished his work, shall divide the spoil with the strong. Thus, in this servant of God, the Messiah

of the old covenant is revealed in his glory as a king, a high-priest and a prophet, while the different characters blended into one harmonious, spiritual whole, appear in a real and historical personality, in Jesus Christ of Nazareth. The servant of God, through obedience, acquires authority to rule: the high-priest terminates the Mosaic sacrifices of animals, and offers himself as a pure and spotless victim; the prophet speaks, suffers and dies.

No hesitation ought, accordingly, to be longer felt by any, to acknowledge that a *suffering* as well as a victorious Messiah is described in the Old Testament.¹ We are, ourselves, fully convinced that Isaiah saw his hope of a Messiah which had undoubtedly been handed down to him, realized in that future servant of God as an individual personality, insomuch that even the earlier and the existing prophetic ideals served merely as faint copies for his own highest and most perfect ideal; and even those biblical critics who cannot share in this conviction are still bound, as christians, to admit that, to the eye of their Redeemer their so-called *collective* servant of God² appeared as only one person, which he, as one person himself, regarded it to be his vocation to realize. Notwithstanding all the arguments which may have been adduced by any writers, we cannot reconcile ourselves to the view that Isaiah, who, more than any other prophet, is absorbed in contemplations of the

¹ [On this question, and on various interesting historical points connected with the ancient Jewish conceptions of the promised Messiah, see, among other authorities, Ebrard, *Wissenschaftl. Krit. d. ev. Gesch.* §§ 121—125; the insertion of his facts and arguments, many of which are illustrative of the positions assumed by Umbreit above, but which do not admit of compression, would extend this note beyond its legitimate limits.—Tr.]

² [The allusion is to one division of certain critics who will not recognize an *individual* in the "servant of God" so frequently mentioned in the last chapters of Isaiah. According to their view, the application of "servant" is used as a *collective* noun, and stands for a *moral person*, as they term it; that is, it denotes an aggregate of persons of the same class or condition, represented under the image of one individual. The "servant" in Isaiah 52: 13—53: 12, is, therefore, the representative of the prophets as a body, or of the whole Jewish people, or of only the virtuous part of the people as a separate class, &c. &c. Those who constitute another division of these critics, and who admit that by this "servant" a certain *individual* is designated, have proposed Isaiah himself as the person, or Jeremiah, or Hezekiah, &c. &c.]

The struggle is very visible in all these ill-sustained hypotheses, to evade the force of entire portions like Isaiah 53, Psalm 22, &c., and it is deliberately asserted by these "Christians," as Umbreit here terms them, in contradistinction from the Jewish commentators who accord with them, that not a trace can be found in the Old Testament of the existence of the belief among the ancient Jews, that the Messiah, whose kingdom is described in the most gorgeous terms, as that of a splendid and victorious hero-king, should also *suffer* and die. We do not deny that the idea of a *suffering* Messiah had become faint or even extinct in the days of Christ, and, indeed, we expect to

establishment of the new covenant, and who has portrayed its nature in colors so vivid, that he has been called the Evangelist of the Old Testament, should, nevertheless, have so widely differed from all the prophets who preceded and followed him, as to expect an *everlasting* covenant, independently of a Mediator by whom it should be established; we cannot believe that this book should contain the strange prediction of numerous Messiahs, and of a theocratic-messianic republic,—a theory diametrically opposed to a strict Monarchism, and to the ultimate perfection of the kingdom, as realized in the undivided dominion of the Lord.

When we advance further in this investigation, and inquire into the form which the Messianic hope assumed after the restoration of the Jewish state, under Zerubbabel and Joshua, we obtain the decisive testimony of the prophet Zechariah, that our convictions respecting the existence of a suffering Redeemer in the Old Testament prophecies, are well-founded and true. For this prophet, whose important predictions respecting the kingdom of God and its Mediator, are characterized by great depth of wisdom, not only represents the just and divinely protected King of Righteousness, as riding upon an ass, in a poor (אֶרֶץ) and humble state, into the rejoicing city, (Zech. 9: 9), but also foresees the unspeakable sufferings of the Messiah, "pierced" by his own people, but, subsequently, mourned for in bitterness, when the season of grace and of supplication for grace has arrived, (ch. 12: 10 sq.). This passage, besides, states a fact of the highest importance: when God says—"they shall look upon me whom they have pierced,"—he, evidently, identifies himself with the Messiah, so that, in completing our conception of the latter, we have obtained in the Old Testament a genuine *Johanneic* element, on which we are particularly anxious to lay an emphasis, because, in this respect, the Old Testament is usually regarded as being defective.

Finally, if, after having found the Messiah of the Old Testament to be in full harmony with the Messiah of the New Testament, we cast a glance at the doctrine which constitutes

find very little sound theology among the corrupt men of that period. But the consequences of believing that the inspired prophets themselves had not *taught* this doctrine, would be disastrous. In that case, Christ, in his actual history, as suffering and dying, does not really correspond to the predictions respecting the Messiah, in a point of the utmost importance, and the full harmony which really exists between the predictions and the events with which Christ is connected, is converted into a discord that must eventually divest the entire Scriptures of their divine character, and destroy alike our Christian faith and our Christian hopes.—Ta.

the basis of the covenant and of the kingdom of the promised Redeemer, we find the same harmony, according to the evidence of all the prophets: the law is converted into the Gospel. The leading features of this prophetic Gospel, have already been sketched above, when we necessarily, connected the person of the Messiah with the operations which were to be produced by him; we shall, therefore, merely add those features which are essential to the completion of the image; and, for the sake of brevity, shall again confine ourselves to that book of the prophet, which has, by way of eminence, been called the Gospel of the New Testament. The *תורה*, or law, for which the isles afar off shall wait, and by which judgment shall be set in the earth, (Isaiah 42: 4) is, preëminently and in truth, the *εὐαγγέλιον*, or Gospel, of the servant of God; for it is the *joyful message* directed not only to Israel but also to the Gentiles, that when they shall have turned unto the living and holy God, the time and the kingdom of divine grace and reconciliation will have arrived. The covenant introduced with such revelations, is a new covenant, not like that which God made with the fathers, and which shall no longer be remembered. The kingdom of truth and love, founded by the Messiah, does not, after a Mosaic exemplar, effect a separation between Israel and other nations: the Gentiles also are brethren. The congregation is a communion of saints, guided by the Holy Spirit, (ch. 63: 11). The worship of God originates in the spirit and in the truth; God dwells not in temples made with hands, but in the contrite heart of the humble, penitent sinner; fasting and the mortification of the body do not afford him honor, but he takes pleasure in them that deal their bread to the hungry, and cover them that are naked, (ch. 58: 7); sacrifices are abolished, and the voice of praise, proceeding from pure lips, takes their place; the temple becomes a house of prayer for all the people. The Gospel is preached to the poor, and chosen apostles go forth and proclaim it to all the world.

*Remarks on the term Messiah.**

[In the English Bible we read: "Thus saith the Lord to his *anointed*, to Cyrus, &c. Many passages which seem to

* These remarks, given by the Translator as a Note to p. 45, being too extended for the ordinary form of a Note, will, we think, form no unwelcome appendix to the article out of which they have grown.—ED.

be partially involved in obscurity, like Matth. 26: 63, Luke 9: 20, &c., become perfectly clear, as soon as we reflect that "Messiah," "Christ," and "Anointed," are equivalent terms, agreeably to John 1: 41. The first, derived from the root *מָשַׁח* to anoint, &c., is verbally rendered by the second, derived from *χρίω* to anoint, &c.; on the use of the latter word, consult Kuinöl on Acts 10: 38. The words in Psalm 2: 2, "against his anointed" are quoted in Acts 4: 26, "against his Christ" in strict conformity to the original. "The expression ἰησοῦς in its immediate application designates merely the human individuality, the historic personality of the Redeemer; Χριστός, on the contrary, is the sacred official name of the expected deliverer of Israel." Olshausen, Com. on Matth. 1: 1. "It is an error to suppose that the name *Christ* designates an attribute of the Son of God—it alwas refers to the union of the divine and the human, in such a sense that the divine principle is represented as sanctifying and anointing his humanity." Ibid. on John 1: 14.

The current statement of the subject, namely, that prophets, priests and kings, were usually anointed, should be received, as it appears to us, with some important qualifications. The anointing of *prophets*, seems to have been by no means, generally practiced. With the exception of the command given to Elijah to "anoint" Elisha, (1 Kings 19: 16), we have no other distinct reference to the anointing of a prophet. Even this case is doubtful. When David, in Psalm 105: 15 (and 1 Chron. 16: 22) in poetic language, represents God as saying, in reference to the patriarchs: "Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm," he cannot be charged with an anachronism, in transferring a Mosaic usage to an era when it was not known, but clearly means by "anointed" to designate the sacred character, or eminent rank of the patriarchs, and, specially, their peculiar duty of serving as depositaries of revealed truth. It may be surmised that the word occurs in the same figurative sense when applied to Elisha, for the plain historic narrative (1 Kings 19: 19) omits the literal unction altogether; and we find an analogous case of this figurative use of the word, where the literal meaning is, by the nature of the case, excluded, in Judges 9: 8, which corroborates our opinion. The anointing of *kings* is also to be understood with some important restrictions. In place of being an ordinary ceremony in the consecration of every Jewish king, it derives new significancy from the very fact, that it seems to have been performed *only in extraordinary cases*, and when Cyrus is called the Lord's "anointed," the idea intended to

be conveyed is, perhaps, not that Cyruis is a *king*, but that he is an agent set apart specially for the performance of a particular service connected with religion; in this sense he is called a "Messiah." We gather from the sacred records that the unction was applied only after a complete change of government had occurred; e. g. Saul, with whom royalty originated, 1 Sam. 10: 1; or when the dynasty was changed, e. g. David, 1 Sam 16: 13; or when the succession was disputed, e. g. Solomon, 1 Kings 1: 34, 39, when Adonijah had attempted to seize the paternal throne; Joash, 2 Kings 11: 2, after the dethronement of Athaliah; Jehoaz, 2 Kings 23: 30, who succeeded to the throne by a popular movement. (See Robinson's Calmet, *Art.* "Anointing," and Winer's *Bibl. Realw. Art.* "König.") The anointing of Absalom, 2 Sam. 19: 10, was, obviously, an irregular and profane act, and is here of no further importance, unless to serve, collaterally, as an illustration of the principle that the royal unction was administered only when the usual course of affairs had been interrupted. Two other kings, Hazael of Syria, and Jehu of Israel, 1 Kings 19: 15, 16, neither of whom belonged to the respective royal family, regarded their anointing as a special call to assume an office which invested the incumbent with peculiar powers, and imposed special duties. When David, during the reign of Saul, shows such reverence towards the king's person, 1 Sam. 24: 6. 26: 9. 2 Sam. 1: 14, he seems to have regarded the unction of Saul as something entirely distinct from his mere royalty: it is not so much Saul, the king, as Saul, the *Lord's Anointed* whose person is sacred in his eyes. The remark of Umbreit, in a preceding passage of this essay, which implies that the idea of a *king* does not essentially belong to the image of the Messiah as it existed in the mind of a prophet, may, *mutatis mutandis*, be applied to David himself, when he uses the term, "the Lord's anointed,"—it is not a mere king whom he describes by the words, and whose attribute of royalty fades before the more splendid character which the unction throws around him, but an individual specially appointed by the Lord for a certain work, by a peculiar ceremony. Now it was the *high-priest* who alone was invariably anointed on assuming the office, and this ceremony was an important feature of his consecration. See Exod. 28: 41. 29: 7. 30: 30. Hence he is called, by way of eminence, "the priest that is anointed," Lev. 4: 3. 16: 32. 21: 10, while there is no evidence that the ordinary priests were anointed. The high-priest's office was the most exalted known in the Mosaic religion, and the religious character of the unction which, in Saul's case, ren-

dered his person sacred, was established by its connection with the high-priest. If "Messiah" is, therefore, in a secondary sense equivalent to "king" it involves, *à fortiori*, the idea of the high-priest, whom it also designates, Exod. 29 : 20 Lev. 16 : 32. 21 : 10. Numb. 35 : 25. When Samuel, before the anointing took place, supposed that an older brother of David was the individual designated, 1 Samuel 16 : 6, he calls him, by anticipation, the Lord's anointed. In all these cases, we infer that the unction constituted a special commission from God to the recipient, under the old covenant. When the Savior, who was never literally anointed with oil, is, therefore, styled "the Lord's anointed," the appellation represents him as one who assumed the highest offices by a peculiar divine appointment. *His* anointing, which placed him at the summit of power and honor, is described in Isaiah 61 : 1, 2, compared with Luke 4 : 17-21 ; the name, "the Lord's anointed" alludes to the *sacerdotal office* of Christ, implies that his *royalty* is of an extraordinary character, and teaches that all previously existing authority is superseded by his own.

As we have already transgressed the limits of a note, we will, in addition to the remark already made, viz. that the anointing of the high-priest was performed in *every* case of consecration, as the rule, while the same ceremony was an *unusual* feature of a coronation, refer only to the fact, that in the profound dissertation on the Messiah, which is contained in the epistle to the Hebrews, while the "throne" is mentioned, e. g. Heb. 8 : 1, still the predominant view of Christ there given, is that of a high-priest. Does not, then, "Messiah" rather imply *pontifex maximus* (chief priest) than *rex* (king)? The entire typical character of the high priest does not seem to us to have been always made sufficiently prominent ; the whole subject, when fully developed, throws additional light on the doctrine of the Atonement.]

ARTICLE IV.

STIER'S DISCOURSES OF THE LORD JESUS.

Die Reden des Herrn Jesu.—Andeutungen für gläubiges Verständniss derselben, von Rudolph Stier, S. T. D. Pfarrer zu Wichlinghausen in Barmen. 6 Bände: Barmen, 1843, sqq. bei W. Langewiesche. [The Discourses of the Lord Jesus—Suggestions for the believing apprehension of the same, by Rudolph Stier, S. T. D., Pastor at Wichlinghausen in Barmen. 6 vols.]

By Rev. H. I. Schmidt, A. M., Prof. of German Lan. and Lit. in Columbia College, N. Y.

"OF the making of many books there is no end," says the wise man, and his words seem to be preëminently true of Commentaries on the Bible, especially the New Testament. In Germany, particularly, one commentary has, for many years past, been following close upon the other, a great number on the entire New Testament, many on detached portions of it, a few on the whole Bible. Many distinct phases of modern theology, "Richtungen" the Germans call them (the word "schools" would be applicable in but very few instances), have their representatives among this immense mass of literature, and, doubtless, there is a very great quantity of it, for the writing of which the world will never be any the better.

It is often said, that we have quite enough commentaries on the Sacred Word; that there are no new discoveries to be made with respect to its truths; that later commentators only repeat what their predecessors have long since expressed, and that it is time there were an end of this writing of learned expositions of the Scriptures. But it is, in various respects, a great mistake thus to think or speak, and all who are acquainted with the more recent theological literature of Germany will think and speak otherwise.

In different minds the same truths are mirrored under very different aspects, and it is not only interesting, but important, because instructive and practically profitable, that phases of truth which do not present themselves to *our* minds, should be reflected into them from the image which they produce in *other* minds. That wisdom which is infinite was pleased to ordain, that the Savior's life and discourses should be recorded by four different Evangelists, whilst one might have sufficed to give us a full length portrait, and even more numerous

discourses than we now have from all the four. But this seems not to have accorded with the design of Providence, in whose all-wise counsels it was deemed better that we should see the Savior's character imaged forth by four very differently constituted minds, and receive his teachings, not, of course, in so many essentially different revelations, which would be absurd, but as they presented themselves to four distinct idiosyncracies. And every attentive reader of the gospels discovers, the more he studies them, with increasing clearness and delight, how they severally exhibit different aspects, various, but all converging, lines of that glorious manifestation of God in the flesh: how they severally set forth truths, or aspects, and relations of truth, which did not equally impress the mental constitution of the others; and how they thus complete each other's work, each furnishing peculiar, important features, which, by their combined effect, set before us a finished, speaking picture, nay, a living, teaching, acting, suffering personage. — It is, moreover, to be considered, that the sacred word is a mine of truth, which can never be exhausted. There is no reason, whatever, why we should be advancing in all other sciences, and stand still, for ever, in the sacred science; why the progress of men toward a clearer, fuller, more profound understanding of scripture-truth, and religious duty, should ever cease. We doubt whether the Church has yet attained to the stature of perfect manhood in Christ, either as regards intelligence or practice. The time will not come, when highly gifted and cultivated minds, guided by the Spirit of truth, shall cease to throw light on the sacred page, and to be employed, as God's instruments, more fully to open our eyes, that we may behold more and more wondrous things out of his law. However much has been done in the department of critical philology, no one but a tyro would affirm, that philological criticism has reached perfection, and has nothing more to accomplish. The researches of antiquaries, the discoveries of science, sometimes send an unexpected ray upon some passage of holy writ. Mental science is perhaps little better than in its infancy. How much is there yet to explore in the inward world of the human soul—how much to define and classify—to explain and reconcile! The progress of psychology, and of true philosophy, is yet, perhaps, to illustrate many a point of doctrine, to make plainer many a matter of duty. The attacks of enemies of the gospel sometimes render new investigations necessary, so that the obscure may become clearer, and that which is undecided, fixed. But let us not multiply illustrations.

We have been told, that to Fritzsche belongs the honor of being the first theologian who has written a Commentary, philologically of profound and decided critical accuracy; and his work is quite recent. But he is an ultra-rationalist, and we do not care to waste time on the study of his unbiblical commentary, in order to convince ourselves of his critical or philological depth and accuracy. Not to mention many other estimable, and truly evangelical commentaries, the importance and value of Tholuck's on the Gospel of St. John, and on the Epistle to the Romans, notwithstanding the great number of those which had preceded them, must be obvious to every one who knows them. But Tholuck is often hasty in his conclusions, superficial and inaccurate, and he has left a great deal to be yet desired. After him came the lamented Olshausen, and, certainly, as a biblical critic and commentator he is far in advance of his friend. Endowed with eminent talents, possessed of great learning, an acute and sagacious inquirer, he was a faithful, profound, and truly devout student of the divine word, and his commentary is deservedly held in high estimation. It is peculiarly valuable for the clear-sightedness, the minuteness and yet comprehensiveness of view, with which he traces, and the distinctness with which he exhibits, the often very recondite connexions between different portions of the gospels, or of the epistles, the order of events, the time, place, and succession of the Savior's discourses, the relations of the several gospels to each other, in short, for the wide sweep, and the profoundly piercing acuteness of his critical eye. Yet Olshausen is sometimes very loose and unsatisfactory in his discussion of obscure or difficult passages, at other times too arbitrary and imaginative in his expositions, inclining, on some points, to rationalistic subtleties; his notion respecting the accumulations, or collected series of discourses of the Savior, in Matthew's gospel, is, to a great degree, purely fanciful; and the tendency of his mind to ultra-spiritualism makes it necessary to be often extremely cautious, ere we adopt his views. His leaning to Final Restorationism is well known to the readers of his commentary; yet his great candor and fairness in commenting on those passages of Holy Writ, which have a bearing on this point, are worthy of all praise.

The most recent [whether Rudelbach's commentary has been completed, we know not] decidedly evangelical commentator on the New Testament, is named, together with the title of his work, at the head of this article: and, certainly, he is a most note-worthy man, and his work is one, which, if we are not widely wrong in our estimate of its merits, is des-

tinged to maintain a very high rank in this department of theological literature. To us it has been truly refreshing; we prize it beyond expression; and it is our present business to make our readers somewhat acquainted with Rudolph Stier, and his delightful commentary on "The Discourses of the Lord Jesus." Of Stier's personal history we regret to say that we know nothing. He has long been the pastor, and evidently, the faithful and laborious pastor, of a congregation in the beautiful valley of Barmen. As an author he has been repeatedly before the public, and all his works are in the highest degree creditable to his head and heart. We exceedingly regret, that we have not been able to obtain the critique on his commentary upon the Savior's discourses, which appeared in the third number of Rudelbach and Guericke's *Zeitschrift für Lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, for the year 1844. We are able to give only the following sentence, which the publisher of the commentary has prefixed, in the second volume, to a list of his publications. "No man understands better than Stier truly and correctly to expound the divine word; and for this work the church should give thanks to God; it will give the modern insane criticism of the gospels (*der toll-gewordenen neuen Evangelien-Kritik*) its death-blow."

Besides the work named at the head of this article, his most important publications are, a Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews; an Exposition, in thirty-two homiletical discourses, of the Epistle of St. James, and a volume of sacred poetry. In Reuter's *Repertorium*, 1847, No. 6., there is a highly laudatory notice of these thirty-two discourses, from which we translate only the following sentence: "In a homiletical point of view we unhesitatingly reckon these reflections of Stier among the most distinguished works that modern times have produced." Of these poems, published under the title: "*Gedichte, christliche und biblische*," a very favorable critique will be found in the second No. of "*Rudelbach und Guericke's Zeitschrift*" for 1847. Even a decidedly rationalistic critic, who writes in "*Nro. 363 der Brockhaus'schen Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, 1845," finds himself obliged, apparently with no little party-reluctance, to ascribe to these poems the highest poetic merit, whilst, of course, their truly evangelical spirit, their strictly christian and biblical character, are distasteful to him.

In the work now more immediately under consideration, his design is to furnish a very full exposition of our Savior's own discourses. Of intervening events, of time when and

place where, of what others said and did, he says no more than the context requires, — no more than is necessary to a complete explanation and elucidation of our Lord's own words, of their meaning, pertinence, scope, and effect. The work consists of six 12 mo. volumes of unequal thickness: but we trust no one will suffer its dimensions to prevent him from studying it, as soon as he can obtain it. We can assure our readers, that we have no where found reason to complain of "too much." We have no brighter hours than those, always eagerly looked for, in which the calls of duty permit us to enjoy the reading of Stier's most delightful volumes. Of the six volumes, four have, each, a separate preface, of which the later ones are, in a good measure, called forth by the harsh and unkind reviews of rationalistic critics. The severity with which he chastizes the arrogance of mere learning, the irreverence and impertinence of speculative rationalists, the self-complacent airs and notions and absurdities, and wilful misrepresentations, and incorrigible perverseness of unbelieving, philosophical theorists, is sometimes positively amusing. No fear of man, though he be a redoubtable Strauss, or a self-sufficient Hegelian, who presumes that without him the omnipotent Sovereign of the Universe could never have attained his highest consciousness, ever deters him from giving utterance to his mature convictions, his honest opinions.

Instead of making an elaborate statement of Stier's design and method in preparing this commentary, it will be much better to let him speak for himself. We shall afford him this privilege, by translating a number of passages found in divers connexions, from his prefaces.

In the preface to Vol. I., after making sundry introductory remarks, in the course of which he shows, that he was perfectly sensible what reception his work would meet with among the learned rationalists of Germany, he proceeds as follows: "It will here again appear, that I, for my humble part belong to those, who will not suffer the contentions about the shell, which are raging on every hand, to prevent them from enjoying the kernel itself, and from inviting to such enjoyment others, who would much rather be *convivii* (guests) than *coqui* (cooks) at the richly furnished table of the Lord, and who prefer taking the medicine to analysing it chemically. Let others inspect, with closer scrutiny than the eastern Magi, the swaddling-clothes of Immanuel, I care only for him whom they enfold." Again: "The stand-point of the exegesis which I here give, is purely and strictly *exegetical*:

to this we, who faithfully adhere to it, all lay claim with perfect justice. Hence, to be reviled by enemies, and censured by friends, because we read and understand the Old Testament as Christ and the Apostles read and understood it, we esteem an honor for which we humbly thank our Lord." Again: "Our exegetical stand-point is not that of the seeker or the finder, still less that of him who misses and rejects, but that of possession. The great ¹ of the manifestation of God in the flesh, of the Spirit in the letter, has become to us the most certain of all certainties. Permit us, therefore, as so many things are permitted, to speak *as* we believe, and *because* we believe; directly from the word, and not round about it; in its own system, and not according to the system of a science, be it theology or philosophy, nor of any body of divinity, or confession; not translating into heterogeneous forms of language or thought, nor renewing at every point, the strife about the certain and safe ground of possession. And let it not be esteemed impertinent, that we earnestly ask and claim hearing and acceptance for what ought to be heard and accepted by man in his entire being (von dem ganzen Menschen). All just (wahre) exposition of the divine word of salvation, must have at least a paraenetic element, as this word itself is paraenetic throughout, and as, on these pages, not the smallest paragraph will be found, designed merely to feed our curiosity (Wisserei). Nothing appears to us more unnatural than a certain dead, dry mode of treating the words of life, which does not speak from and to the heart, and is styled purely scientific." Again: "I have not neglected the commentaries, either of the unbelieving or of the believing; but I have still more industriously searched out, collected, and, since about twenty years, found, in the most practical use for my heart and office, the immediate emanations of the living text. I openly avow, before God and the world, that all the theology and criticism of the age, the quarter, half, and three-quarters, believing, has since then only confirmed and established me in the joyful confession: I know in whom I believe—I *know* what I read and what I have in that word, which shall abide when the world shall pass away, and the smallest saying of which supplies a better dying-pillow than all that we might otherwise know and possess." These passages from the preface, indicative of the author's design and spirit, might suffice. Yet, while we trust that those who buy

¹ Behold, I; or: Behold, here am I; rendered, by the authorized English version, Is. 52: 6, "Behold it is I."—T_R.

his work will not omit to read his preface, we shall have occasion to give some more extracts ere we have done.

This commentary of Stier's has not only a distinct and well defined character of its own, but it is peculiar, also, in its *method*. It combines the critical and the practical, the learned exposition and the earnest application, in a manner and degree not elsewhere found. Whilst it aims at explaining and elucidating the meaning of our Lord's discourses, it seeks equally to excite in men a sense of their need of him, and to bring them, in the exercise of faith, to his feet and his cross. And let it not be supposed that the work has received this practical character at the expense of strict exegesis and learned exposition. On the contrary, it presents, on every page, the most satisfactory evidence of vast reading and research, of great and profound learning, and of acute critical sagacity. There is about the work an honest straight-forwardness, combined with an humble dependence on divine aid, and a deep reverence for divine things, for the great mysteries of redemption, which is truly delightful. With all this firm conviction, that he has something substantial and truly valuable to give, the author parades no airs of superior penetration and wisdom. Sensible that God has given him talents, and anxious to make a faithful use of them, he is convinced that he has gathered fruit from the great tree of living fruit, and he desires to communicate of his acquisitions to others. He sees, and hears, and reads how error and falsehood, and irreverent rationalism, and infidel speculation are wantonly trifling with the word of God, and playing their insolent game on every hand, to the perversion of men's minds and the ruin of their souls; and he deals with all such willful errorists and corruptors of mankind with great but deserved severity. Irreligious biblical criticism (what a combination of terms!) meets with no mercy at his hands. As he distinctly defines his position with reference to such philosophical and unbelieving critics, we cannot do better than again translate from his preface to the third volume. "With a certain description of criticism belonging to the present age—criticism run mad, as I have called it, and I have no more suitable name for it—people like myself have so much the less reason to trouble themselves, because it receives ample attention from other quarters. If it imagines, in its self-conceit, that it has now succeeded in utterly undermining the gospel of John, whose legitimacy is attested by so extraordinary an amount of external and internal evidence, that scarcely any other book, sacred or profane, possesses a double seal so powerfully convincing, I shall con-

tribute my not heavy mite to the chastisement and contempt which it deserves, simply by ignoring it, as though it had no existence. I have, for my part, far better things to do than to assume the duty¹ imposed upon others, of replying to those who are insane enough to undertake to show that the Lord of Glory, in whose bosom John lay, is nothing but a mythical goblin, a product of later times, or a historico-symbolical substratum, squared and cut out to suit gnostic doctrines. O that, whenever *such* opponents are to be dealt with, it might always be done with the authority of that truth which stands firm as the sun in the heavens, and with the *παρρησία* (free speech) of that faith which once wrote the subscription: "This is the disciple who witnesseth concerning these things, and who has written these things; and we know that his witness is true." May such brave champions as, e. g. Dietlein and Thiersch be on their guard, lest, like the latter, they should themselves again construe too 'scientifically.'

That so many of those who believe and see should ever and again drag with them the entire community of the blind, for whom there is no remedy in heart and conscience but the doctrinal A B C pointed out in Hebr. 6: 1, and should endeavor to restore their sight by means of mere 'scientific discussion,' before they themselves enjoy and faithfully improve the illuminating influence of light, this continues to be the heavy drag, (*hemmschuh*) obstructing the profitable progress of a believing theology, and of a profound knowledge of the scriptures. For, as there is no science which has no bearing on the faith or unbelief of men, so also there is no merely scientific method which can produce faith in the willfully unbelieving. At some favorable hour they might be more effectually reached by one who should preach to them repentance, than by all the books of polemic science that are written against them. But there are some who are so evil, that they require, in the first instance, something else than exhortations to repentance. The time will come when, if our books should last so long, men will be scarcely able to comprehend how *christian* scholars should have been able, in our day, to deal so softly and gingerly, and respectfully, even with *children of Satan*, as soon as these had once flung around them the mantle of learning—instead of casting their flimsy rags into their faces, which are turned, with a sneering grin, toward Christ."

Stier's own soundness in the faith is beyond all question. The manner in which he announces (Pref. vol. I, p. xvii)

¹ He alludes to the duty laid by the King of Prussia upon, if we recollect aright, Tholuck and Neander, of replying to Strauss's *Leben Jesu*.

his belief in the inspiration of the scriptures, affords evidence, not only of his claims as a safe expounder of the divine word, but of his fervent piety and deep humility.

Those who are acquainted with the different species into which exegesis is divided, will find it difficult to determine to which specific class the work before us properly belongs. This is, however, by no means the result of any vagueness in its character, but rather, as we have already intimated, of its peculiarity. The work is altogether *sui generis*, and will, it is to be hoped, originate a new and distinct class of commentaries. Its most important peculiarity is, as we have seen, the prominence which the author gives to the paraenetic element. This characteristic will render the work exceedingly valuable to preachers; for, in their preparations for the pulpit they will find it in a high degree and most delightfully suggestive. It furnishes, indeed, no dry bones—no *skeletons* for the indolent; but it presents a vast amount of striking and important thoughts, of profound and most profitable reflections, of apt and beautiful illustrations. We shall here give another extract from his preface to vol. IV, which, while it bears directly on this point, will throw additional light on his general stand-point. "What says the word? This is the inquiry of the expositor. But this, at all events, means in the first place: What does it say to *me*? And as a corrective of narrow-minded subjectiveness is here required, the question will most properly run as follows: What has it said to the church in all ages? Although the last form of the question points directly to the historical method, the aim of this method can again be no other than this: What does the Word say more particularly to the church as it now is, to the believers of my day, to whom it is my duty and desire to expound it, not as a teacher standing without their circle, or above them, but as a serving member? Here, then, we have the consciousness of the present church, so far as the expositor, from his subjective stand-point, correctly discerns it according to historical data, as the *secondary* factor of exposition for the *primary* import of the word. This I designate as genetically historical with a better right than others thus designate something else. How does the living word speak through me, as a member of the church? This is my exegetical principle, and in accordance with it I hope (as by the testimony of many I am encouraged to do) more particularly to afford aid to preachers and ministers of the word, who so often find, in the most learned and profoundly critical commentaries, so little that is available, and so many expositions which con-

demn themselves by their utter uselessness for the pulpit." It is to this exegetical principle that he ascribes what has, by way of reproach, been termed "*Die ganz eigenthümliche Zwittergestalt*," the peculiar form in which his commentary appears.

Stier belongs to no *school*, either in philosophy or theology. He is an independent thinker and inquirer, ardently engaged in the search after truth. He pins his faith to no man's sleeve, not even Luther's, from whom, though in general, and by his own honest convictions, a very decided Lutheran, he ventures to differ, and does not hesitate to say so. Thus he brings no dogmatic system with him to the study of the Bible, to which the divine word must perforce be made to conform. He searches the scriptures for himself, yet in a spirit of great candor and docility. He does not scruple to use his "private judgment" in making out their meaning, yet never despising or rejecting the really valuable aid which others have to give, and above all, with prayerful and humble reliance on the help of that Spirit who leadeth into all truth. He is truly a Bible-christian, and his one great aim is to learn at the fountainhead of truth and wisdom, and, himself being thence instructed, to instruct others. We do not mean to say that he brought no distinct opinions, no definite doctrinal views, to the critical study and exposition of the scriptures. To say so would be worse than childish. But we do mean, that he is not so wedded to his own opinions and views as not to be ready at once to relinquish them, so soon as profound and candid study has convinced him that they are at variance with scripture. Yet, every man that has a mind has his own way of looking at things—his own peculiar stand-point, his own peculiar mode of thinking—and it cannot be otherwise than that to the investigation of any subject he will bring his peculiar modes and habits of thought, and his decided views and opinions; subject always, if his aim be truth, to correction and amendment. On this subject, also, it will be worth while to hear what he himself has to say. "The Review (in Tholuck's Liter. Anzeiger, 1844, Nro. 68-70) already mentioned, says, that with me 'the subjective christian life and mode of thinking of the author, and of the present community of the awakened is the primary factor' of my exposition. Here I protest, in the first place, against the merely 'present community,' with its almost anti-pietistically selected, strange adjunct 'of the awakened;' more particularly, in the second place, against the 'primary factor.' No; for me this truly is and remains the exegetical development of the true meaning of the word, in which I

seek to immerse both myself and the reader. If any one does not find with me, on the whole, this 'genetic' developement of the sense of scripture, (apart from occasional errors of previously formed views and opinions, from which scarcely any uninspired expositor can be expected to be free, and which are readily admitted), of him I cannot but apprehend that the fault is rather to be sought in his eye or in his spectacles. As regards the *subjective*, I would take the liberty to ask whether, really, any one has yet invented the art of going out of himself, and whether the proudest vaunting of impartiality, of freedom from bias or prejudice, of objectiveness, is not frequently the mere wail of an inflated subject, utterly incapable of perceiving the object. Whether the best intentioned, most earnest, and all-comprehending method, if designed to proffer any thing at all, cannot, after all, only proffer what the subject possesses of knowledge and experience? It is perhaps only by having the word dwelling in us, and in proportion as it dwells in us, (John, 5 : 38), that we are able to understand and explain it. He that does not, as an expositor, recognize this limit, cannot any longer be sensible that he is, and continues to be, an individual. And in order to point out this limit, the name is placed on the title-page, preceded by 'explained by,' and not by 'revealed through,' as in the case of Swedenborg."

We have read, with great attention and care, various and extensive portions of our author's work, and if we are capable of judging, he has faithfully and successfully carried out his plan and design, as announced in the passages which we have cited. The fruits of laborious study, of deep thought, of great learning, and of sincere and fervent piety, are manifest on every page. Never attempting to carry any thing into the Bible, nor resolved, at all hazards, to find in it his own notions and doctrinal views, he takes the inspired word simply as it speaks, in its integrity, to the undying spirit of man, and earnestly applies all the powers of his mind, and all the extraneous aids which he possesses, to discover, from its own language, without perversions or arbitrary constructions, its real meaning, and to set it forth with all needful perspicuity and fullness. And surely, with all his pure and exalted conception of our blessed Savior's character and design—with his close attention to the peculiar nature of the different occasions on which his discourses were pronounced—with his sagacious estimate of the character of those to whom they were addressed, or by whom they were called forth—with his acuteness in discerning those often very slightly intimated points,

which connect different portions of scripture—with his calm and unbiassed judgment in weighing every word and circumstance—with his profound learning and his vast reading in Biblical literature, and, in fine, with his keen perception of the practical bearing of our Lord's discourses, and his ready tact and skill in bringing them out, in a highly instructive, awakening, or edifying form, it would be strange indeed, if any candid reader could lay down his book without having derived from it unspeakable profit, either as a theologian or a christian.

Of his acuteness to discover, and his skill to unfold, the character, motives, feelings, and prejudices of those who sought converse with the Savior, we have a striking instance in his discussion of Christ's interview with Nicodemus. Some, indeed, may be induced to ascribe his minute delineations of the character, views, and purposes of Nicodemus to his imaginative powers. But to us they appear exceedingly acute, and strikingly just; and we can ascribe them only to his profound knowledge of human nature, to his accurate estimate of the character of the Pharisees, to his close attention to every word and turn of expression, to his nice perception of slight circumstances, which are apt to escape a vision less keen and practiced, and to his sound and correct judgment in assigning to each its appropriate weight and importance.

Take it all in all, we consider Stier's Commentary on "*Die Reden des Herrn Jesu*" as one of the most (in some respects the most) valuable and delightful productions in the department of exegesis that ever proceeded from the German press. Our object has simply been to invite attention to this work, and not to write a review of it. It was our intention to translate, for this article, interesting passages from the body of the commentary itself, and to accompany them with such observations as might seem necessary. But the length which our remarks have already unexpectedly reached, compels us to defer the execution of this design to some future day.

ARTICLE V.

LUTHER'S LARGER AND SMALLER CATECHISMS.

By John G. Morris, D. D., of Baltimore, Md.

WE regard it as a very favorable sign of the times in our church; that the ancient and salutary practice of catechetical instruction has of late engaged more than ordinary attention among us. The different periodicals have uttered their almost oracular voice, and not a few of the Synods have passed resolutions recommending it to pastors and people. It has been the theme of elaborate pulpit discourses, and of frequent discussion in conferences and at occasional clerical meetings. All this promises the most beneficial results, and is an unmistakable evidence of the revival of genuine church feeling, as well as of increasing interest in the proper religious training of the younger members of the household of faith.

It was never true, as has been elsewhere stated, without reason or authority, that the practice has been generally abolished in our church in this country. It is certain, however, that here and there one pastor might be found who esteemed himself wiser than his fathers, and suffered himself to be deterred from the performance of it either by his own distaste for a plain ministerial duty, by his dislike for extraordinary labor, by the senseless jeers of uninstructed sectaries around him, or by an overweening fondness for every species of innovation. There are few men among us who are willing to have it said that they have abolished it in their churches. Some who were suspected, have even taken pains to correct the false report, conscious that their loyalty to the church might very naturally be called in question if they have given up a practice sanctioned by apostolic usage, by the ancient church, by the reformers, and by all the good and great men of every age, down to the present time. There are very few now who wait for the extraordinary manifestations of grace for the conversion of their young people, without employing the ordinary means, or who find a religious meeting of some days' continuance a good substitute for the old catechetical system. We are glad to hear that most of our pastors give catechetical instruction even to those who have been awakened at such meetings, before they have been admitted to confirmation and the Lord's Supper; and this must be regarded as a decided improvement on the system that prevailed to some extent not

very long ago. It may be a question whether, after all, the most wholesome protracted meeting for young people would not be one of three or four months' duration with a catechetical class.

Happily there is not a periodical in our church that is not an ardent advocate for the practice, and it would really be an anomalous *Lutheran* journal if it were not so. For is it not one characteristic of us as a people? Is it not one of those distinctive qualities by which we are known from many other religious families around us? and is it not especially Luther's catechism which we all use in one form or other—a book which, if sincerely believed in all its teachings, will sufficiently distinguish us from our christian neighbors? We want no broader line than the catechism draws; but then we do not want that line whitewashed out by a diluted and false liberalism, so as nearly to obliterate it. We desire to see it remain in its original breadth and depth, so that we may consistently and honestly reply to the query, "What are the distinctive doctrines of your church?" "You will find an epitome of them in Luther's Smaller Catechism."

Next to Luther's translation of the Scriptures, none of his books exerted so extensive and wholesome an influence on the Protestant cause as his *Larger and Smaller Catechisms*. The latter, particularly, was translated into all the modern languages of Europe, and into Hebrew, Greek, Arabic, and Latin. Even the Malabars of India, and other eastern nations, read it in their own tongue. It has been illustrated in many a ponderous tome—it has been made the basis of sermons by the most celebrated preachers of the church—learned professors have used it as the ground of their doctrinal lectures—historians have made it the theme of many a curious and elaborate volume—commentators in scores have expended their strength upon it, and the enemies of the Reformation have assailed it with demoniacal rancor and hate. So much did the Jesuits of a later day fear its overwhelming influence, that they committed in relation to it one of the most villainous frauds that is to be found in literary history. They concocted a catechism, by perverting Luther's words, so as to make it appear a defence of Popery, and published it as his own. Even poets, scholastics, astronomers, grammarians, and astrologers not excluded, have expended much ink and paper in versifying and explaining it on the principles of their respective theories. All these numerous writings on so small a book have continued through a period of more than three hundred years, and constitute a literature so extensive that no man

can boast of having a thorough acquaintance with it. Even to the present time, the catalogues of German book-sellers announce additional illustrations, and analyses of Luther's Catechism, some of which, however, must be designated as obscurations, for they darken his words, dilute his doctrines, and pervert his meaning. They corrupt instead of correcting; they falsify instead of verifying—"Quot correctiones, tot corruptiones."

These two books were not the first of a similar character which the Reformer wrote and published. Even as early as 1518, he had issued an Explanation of the Ten Commandments and of the Lord's Prayer, and in 1520, a brief "Direction for Studying the Commandments and the Creed, and for using the Lord's Prayer." All the catechisms used in the church of Rome up to that day, embraced only these three heads, and Luther, very wisely, did not abruptly depart at that early period of the Reformation, from the universal custom which had been sanctioned by so many centuries.

Though he was the first of all the Reformers to prepare such writings for the common people, yet he was not the only one who labored in that department of literature. Not a few of his noble coadjutors, among whom were Tolzen, Bugenhagen, Melancthon, Brenz, and others, also wrote books of this character before Luther published the two catechisms now under consideration. But this did not deter him from bringing out his books. He was not influenced by that false modesty which often holds back a really good book, nor by fear of the critic, nor by feelings of questionable delicacy to his compeers who had already occupied the field. He saw that their writings for popular use were deficient in system and order, and that they were not so well adapted to the instruction of beginners in Christianity, whether adults or children. He resolved, then, to publish the two books, called the Larger and the Smaller Catechism, and both appeared in 1529.

The necessity of such writings for that generation will abundantly appear from the state of catechetical instruction and the prevailing ignorance of gospel truth. Though this mode of teaching had not been altogether abolished in the church of Rome, yet the books used were wretched compilations of legendary tales, silly stories of saints of questionable sanctity; the truth was obscured by grievous errors, and neutralized by the mixture of impious superstitions. Luther himself tells us, "that there was no divine among the Romanists who knew or understood the decalogue, the creed, and the

Lord's Prayer, as well as the children who had been taught by him and his helpers;" and Matthesius, a cotemporary of Luther, who preached and published seventeen sermons on Luther's life, says: "that he does not remember to have heard in twenty-five years, any thing from the pulpit, in the Romish church, relating to these chief parts of christian doctrine, nor was any thing of the kind taught in the schools."

The direct occasion of writing these catechisms, was the church visitation which Luther and others performed in 1527-8, by order of the Elector of Saxony, in the dominions of that prince. A full account of this is given in Seckendorf's *Historia Lutheranismi*, Lib. II., p. 101, and we wish we had room for a more extended notice than we are permitted here to give. Melancthon was appointed to draw up "The Instructions to the Visitors of the pastors in the Electorate of Saxony," which were sanctioned by Luther and Bugenhagen. At the request of the Elector, Luther wrote a preface to the Instructions, and they were then published together. He therein defends the measure, and derives arguments from both the Old and New Testaments, to show the propriety and expediency of commissioning prudent and pious men to visit the pastors and churches. The office of visitation has been renewed in this country by the Missouri Synod of our church, which will probably derive much benefit from it. It may be well adapted to their pastors and people, who have been trained under different ecclesiastical influences from ours. It would not suit us in the East, nor our church in this country in any section, whose pastors and people have been brought up uncontrolled by ecclesiastical authority beyond that of their own congregation, and where they are exceedingly jealous of the most harmless aspirings towards ecclesiastical power, on the part of the clergy.

The design of this visitation in Luther's time was to ascertain the state of the churches—the doctrines of the preachers and hearers—their morals and religious attainments—the condition of the schools—the improvement of the pupils, and the qualifications of teachers. They were instructed to prescribe a better mode to preachers and teachers of discharging their respective offices—to advise the people to support public worship, and to proceed rigorously against the obstinate and perverse; in a word, to make a full examination into every thing that related to ecclesiastical affairs.

To Luther was assigned the electorate of Saxony and the districts of Meissen, and Jonas and Bugenhagen were to take his place if he should be prevented. He found things in a

wretched condition—the ministers and people were pitifully ignorant—the plainest truths of the Gospel were misapprehended, and its most common precepts were misapplied.—But a few extracts from Luther will vividly represent the true condition of affairs. In the preface to the Smaller Catechism he says: “Alas! what a sad state of things have I witnessed! The common people, especially in the villages, are so utterly ignorant of the christian doctrine, and even many pastors quite unprepared and unqualified to teach, who yet are all called Christians, are baptized and partake of the holy Supper, but know neither the Lord’s Prayer, nor the Creed, nor the Decalogue, and act like like irrational creatures.” In his letters he says: “We every where find poverty and want; may the Lord send laborers into his vineyard.”—“Our visitation progresses; alas! what wretchedness we behold!”

Luther’s soul was moved to compassion, and he at once determined to write the catechisms for the especial benefit of that ignorant people. He tells us that he was compelled by their heart-moving spiritual wants, to present the truth in such a simple form, and he acquitted himself of a duty which lay heavily upon his conscience.

Both these catechisms were published in 1529, and although there has been much discussion on the subject of the priority of publication, the weight of the testimony is in favor of the Larger. Most probably that was issued in January, and the Smaller in October of the same year. To the three principal parts, viz. the Decalogue, the Creed, and the Lord’s Prayer, which were usually comprehended in all the previous catechisms, Luther added two others, viz. Baptism, and the Lord’s Supper. Some of the earlier writers designate six parts in the catechisms, including Directions for Confession and Absolution; but even if Luther wrote this, he did not design it to constitute a distinct head. There is, however, some doubt whether the Reformer wrote it, and hence some ascribe it to Bugenhagen. The ideas, at any rate, are taken from Luther’s other writings, and almost in his own words. It appears in the second edition of the catechism, and was doubtless sanctioned by him. In the book of Concord, it is inserted between the articles of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper of the Catechism, but it is not separated from the latter; subsequently, there was added another part, called *The Power of the Keys*, founded on *Matth.* xvi: 19, xviii: 18, and particularly *John*, xx: 23. It is well known that these passages have been shamefully perverted by the church of Rome, for her priests claim the absolute power of pardoning sin. Abso-

lution with us, is nothing more than the *power bestowed on ministers of announcing the pardon of sin to true penitents*. It is merely *declarative* and *hypothetical*, and not *collative* and *judicial*. We do not *confer* absolution—we only *declare* it, on condition of repentance, faith, and holiness. The minister does not set himself up as a judge, but only announces the promise of God. Any other Christian could just as well pronounce absolution, but for the sake of church-order and fitness, the exercise of the right has been limited to ministers. This article in the Catechism was not written by Luther. It does not appear in the earliest editions, nor in any part of Luther's writings, nor in the book of Concord. It has been attributed by some to Knipstrow, and by others to Brenz, and Carpzov tells us that it was doubtless prepared and inserted in the Catechism when the Calvinists tried hard to abolish Confession and Absolution in the churches.

To the Five Articles of the Smaller Catechism, Luther added an appendix, consisting of questions and answers relating to family religion—domestic, civil and ecclesiastical duties. These appendices are, at least, attributed to him, inasmuch as they appear in the earlier editions of the book. There are two other editions which were considered important in that early period of the Reformation; one, A Form for the Celebration of Marriage, and the other for, the Administration of Baptism. These were designed for the use of unlearned pastors, and, of course, constitute no part of the Catechism proper. It is not easy to determine when they were first appended to the book, nor even whether they were written by Luther. They were not printed in the first edition of the Book of Concord, which appeared in Dresden in 1580. This gave great offence, not only to the Helmstädt divines, but the Elector of Brandenburg and Duke William of Luneburg, were also deeply concerned about the omission, and, *of course*, not a few *pro* and *contra* pamphlets were exchanged.

The "Questions for those who would prepare themselves to receive the Lord's Supper," were not written by Luther, but most probably by Dr. Lange, one of his friends. They do not appear in the earlier editions, and were not printed at all during Luther's lifetime. No one ever pretended that "The Order of Salvation" came from the pen of the Reformer, but it was written many years after by Dr. Freylinghausen. It follows, then, that *Luther's* Shorter Catechism consists *exclusively* of the "Five Principal Parts," as we have them in the Book of Concord, and all the other appendices must be carefully distinguished from the original work.

The contents of the two books may be summed up as follows: We take them in their original unity, unrefined and *unimproved* by modern hands.

The *Smaller* contains an Introduction, which is not printed in the modern editions. It gives an account of the occasion and design of the book, and directions for its proper use, with admonitions against the neglect of catechetical instruction. It exposes the corruptions of popery, and urges on pastors, parents and rulers, the duty of indoctrinating the ignorant and the young in the truths of the Gospel. It is written in Luther's most powerful style, and reminds us of Melancthon's words: *Fulgura erant lingue cuncta, Lutheræ, tuæ*.¹ Walch says of this preface, "*lectu dignissima est*,"² and we wish it were within the reach of every pastor and parent.

The first chief part consists of an epitome of the Decalogue, and in the division of the commandments Luther followed that which had been in use for centuries. On this subject, it will be necessary to say a few words in explanation. In all the European, and in most of the American editions, that which is usually called the second commandment, and which forbids the worship of images, is omitted, and in order to make up the ten in number, that which is the tenth in some other catechisms, is divided into two. What was Luther's design in this omission? Did he favor the worship of images and the invocation of saints? No man ever wrote, argued and preached more powerfully and successfully against them. They were both, objects of his implacable hate. Why, then, leave out this commandment? 1. That which is usually regarded as the second commandment, was considered by Luther and multitudes of other learned and good men, in every age of the church, as an expansion and illustration of the first; and as he studied brevity for the sake of the ignorant of his day he did not insert it. 2. Some of the others are abbreviated for the same reason, particularly the one relating to the Sabbath. He looked upon them both as containing amplifications which he did not think it necessary to insert in his book. 3. There is no division of the Decalogue into numbers in the Scriptures, and hence any division is legitimate, if the ten are retained and the subjects are properly conjoined. 4. The ninth and tenth were divided, because they relate to different objects, and the difference between the numbers must

¹ "Lightnings were all the words, Luther, that fell from thy lips."—R.

² "It is most worthy to be read."

be founded on the diversity of objects. The General Synod's edition is thus divided, but it inserts the illustration of the first and the third.

The Lutheran division of the commandments is usually styled the Augustinian, because Augustine was the most distinguished of the fathers, who adopted it. Before him it was adopted by Clemens of Alexandria, and after him by Beda, Nicholas de Lyra, and a host of other great divines. It was also the one in common use among the Jews, although Josephus and Philo do not follow it. The other division is called the *Origenian*, and was followed by Irenæus, Jerome, Ambrose, and many others.

Each commandment is followed by an explanation which in a few words developes the whole truth contained in it. Never were these "ten words" of God more distinctly and forcibly illustrated in so brief a space. The very kernel of each is brought to light and exposed to the eye and the mind of the reader.

The Second Part contains that ancient symbol of the church, the Apostles' Creed. In his German translation of the third article, Luther very properly has it, *eine heilige christliche Kirche*, (one holy christian church) instead of *Katholische*, (Catholic). This is not a perversion of the original, but it also prevents misconception. The phrase, *eine Katholische Kirche*, would be wholly misunderstood in most German congregations, and would lead to mischievous results. Indeed, the use of the expression, *Catholic Church*, in the Creed, is not always understood even in an assembly of English worshippers, but it is more objectionable in German than in English, for no other expression is employed by the masses of Germans to designate what we call the *Church of Rome*.¹ The Romanists abused Luther most unchristianly for leaving out the word *Katholische*, and charged him with falsifying the Creed. But, as in all other questions of a similar character, these furious assailants were sent back to their kennels howling with despair. Gerhard, Scharnel and others, showed that, before the time of Luther, it was customary to recite those very words: *ich glaube eine heilige christliche Kirche* (I believe in one holy christian church)! In the ancient symbols of the *Latin* church, the word *Catholic* does not occur. It was adopted by the *Greek* church, and afterwards came into general use, but when it was added to the Creed is not easy

¹ We observe that at least in one of the German translations of the Episcopal Book of Common Prayer, they have it, *eine Katholische Kirche*, which, we are sure, will prevent its general use among the Germans.

to determine. Walch, *Introduct. Lib. II. § 8.*, discusses this subject at length, and gives much curious and learned information about it. Luther himself did not reject the term *catholic*, but held it to be synonymous, in an ecclesiastical sense, with *christian*. He uses the word in *Smalc. Art. Part III. § 12.*, *credo sanctum ecclesiam catholicam, sive christianam*, (I believe in a holy catholic, or christian church).

In his explanation of the first section of the Creed, he recites the benefits we receive from God the Father and our consequent obligations to him. In the second, the benefits from the redemption by Christ; and never was this article more comprehensively treated or more thoroughly explained. In the third, the necessity and nature of the means and operations of grace and the benefits flowing to the whole church from the Holy Ghost, are forcibly set forth.

The third part of the Catechism consists of the Lord's Prayer, which he divides into the introductory address, seven petitions and the doxology; each of which is illustrated in his peculiarly pithy and forcible style.

The *Fourth* part treats of the first sacrament of the New Testament, or Baptism, as a means of grace established for reuniting man with God, and is treated under four principal questions. The *first* does not embrace properly an explanation of baptism, but rather those things which are necessary to constitute it, as water, the word of God, including the command in *Matth. 28: 9*, which is also added.

The *Second* illustrates the benefits or effects of baptism, to which is appended *Mark 16: 16*. This is, however, not to be understood as limiting the benefits of baptism to the presence of faith, or rendering faith indispensable to a participating in the ordinance. The sacraments are acts of God's grace towards us, and not our acts of devotion or service toward him. He no more asks the consent of a child to be born into his kingdom by baptism, than He consults it about being born into the world. In both instances, He performs the work of His own gracious will. [This is God's part of the work: but on the part of man, *faith* is always required in adults to a salutary reception of baptism as well as of the Lord's Supper; and that in the case of infants faith is an *ultimate* element and essential to their salvation, is also involved in the Lutheran system.]

In the *Fifth*, or last part, the Lord's Supper is treated under four sections. In the *first*, we have the nature, the essential components and divine institution of the sacrament, in the words of its founder. In the *second*, its benefits are set forth;

in the *third*, the manner in which those benefits are produced, and in the *fourth*, our obligations to prepare ourselves for a worthy participation, which is limited to faith.

This, then, is an extremely succinct analysis of *The Shorter Catechism*, but we are not permitted to enlarge.

The *Larger Catechism* is not so well known to pastors and catechumens in this country, even to those who can read it in the original language, as it deserves to be. We have never met with an English translation of it, and that accounts, to some extent, for its limited circulation among us. It is not often seen printed by itself, and the Book of Concord, in which it is contained, has not, heretofore, been so widely distributed as it should be. We are, however, glad to observe strong symptoms of a *revival* of symbolic theology among our ministers. Every one of us will be the better, in many respects, for studying that immortal work.

But we must return to the *Larger Catechism*. It is many times larger than the other, and of itself makes a duodecimo of quite respectable size. It has two prefaces, the first of which is very long, and contains a regular treatise on the necessity of frequently preaching the word, and especially of catechetical instruction for the young. It is written in Luther's boldest manner, and contains many of his severest expressions. It is a sort of sledge-hammer style, which would hardly be considered polite in this refined age. His soul seems to be fired with holy ire against his adversaries, the pope, the devil and the priests, and he unmercifully hurls against them all the bolts of his righteous wrath. The Latin translation has been softened down, for we presume that language furnished no words to render the *volcanic* expressions and thoughts of Luther.

The second preface is much shorter, and is properly an introduction to the text. It defines the Greek word *Katechismos*, and enforces the obligation of parents and masters to teach it to their households, and of every body, young and old, to become well acquainted with its contents.

The catechism itself consists of two divisions. The first contains the text of the five principal parts of the *Smaller*, and there is here a still further abbreviation than in the former. After the three first, follow some excellent rules for learning and daily reciting them by children, and even by adults, and we wish that the counsels of the Reformer were followed at the present day.

In the *second* division, the *Five Principal Parts* are illustrated at length. This explanation, of course, embraces much

relating to the abuses of popery, which were at that time familiar to every body. All his extended observations on the commandments are most edifying and impressive. They would not, perhaps, receive the approbation of all modern theologians, particularly those on the Sabbath, but Luther's views on that subject did not differ from those of all the great divines of that generation. After a short introduction to the Creed, there follows a masterly commentary on that ancient symbol. On the subject of faith and redemption Luther is always great.

If any man desires to see the nature, necessity, hindrances, and benefits of prayer illustrated in a powerful manner, let him read Luther on the Lord's Prayer, which constitutes the third article of this catechism. It is a subject he well understood, for no man ever more faithfully practiced prayer, and no man ever experienced more signal benefits from it. He spent hours of every day upon his knees in close communion with God, and knew well how to speak and write of it for the instruction of others. His commentary on the Lord's Prayer has been, for three centuries, printed as a tract, and has been distributed in uncounted numbers. In it he gives us the results of his own rich experience, and seems to take a peculiar pleasure in writing on it.

His exposition of the two Sacraments, constituting the fourth and fifth parts of the book, ably set forth the distinctive features of the Lutheran theology. They embrace views which are not universally adopted even by those who call themselves after his name, but which, we honestly believe, will be more highly appreciated the more carefully they are studied and the more thoroughly they are understood. We do not here include all that Luther ever taught, or claim scriptural authority for all his peculiar views on all subjects. If his explanations of God's word do not harmonize with other portions, let them fall, but hear him before you strike him. Let not his teachings be judged by the rules of a false philosophy, or the faint glimmerings of the taper-light of human reason; let the everlasting Word decide, and it will not be hard to find out where the truth lies. There are some who dogmatically condemn Luther's views on the Sacraments, and yet do not know what they are—they have never studied them, and still presumptuously expect to be listened to by sensible men whilst they prate on a subject they do not understand. Yet these men are ardent admirers of Luther; they flare up prodigiously when his venerated name is assailed; they boldly rush into the arena of controversy in vindication of his honor;

but after all, that which is peculiarly distinctive in his theology, they reject.

But we are glad to see a return to the family mansion by those of Luther's household in this country. They have wandered long enough among the dwelling places of strangers, for they have almost forgotten the language and the plain blunt manners of their father's family. Some of them have put on strange airs, and have departed from the simplicity that prevailed at home. They have fashioned their theological garments after the ever-varying taste of the modern artiste, and have adopted too many inventions and "notions" of the land so productive of both. Let them come back and reassume the simple but comfortable garb of the fathers, and eat of the rich and wholesome abundance of the family board.

We need not be surprised at hearing that these books of Luther received, as they well deserved, the most rapturous laudations from many of his admirers. Although many of them did not carry their veneration of them to the same extravagant length with an old Silesian prince, who had them buried with him, because, next to the Bible, he derived more benefit from them than from all other books, yet their admiration knew scarcely any bounds. Polycarp Lyser, in his preface to Chemnitz's *Loc. Com.*, as quoted by Walch, says, "Luther wrote a short catechism which is more precious than gold or gems, in which the essential purity of the prophets' and apostles' doctrine is so concentrated in one entire body, and is conveyed in such perspicuous language, that it may be deservedly regarded as a canon or rule of faith; for every thing therein is taken from the canonical scriptures. I can positively affirm that this little book contains such a copious fullness of every thing necessary to be known for salvation, that if all faithful preachers of the gospel, throughout their whole lives, were to treat of nothing else in their sermons, than the hidden wisdom of God comprehended in these few pages, and would properly explain it to the common people, and illustrate each part from the scriptures, they would never be able to exhaust this fountain of immense depth." *Matthesius*, in his *Sermons on the Life of Luther*, says: "If Dr. Luther had done nothing more in his whole life than introduce these two catechisms into families, schools, and the pulpit, the world would never be able sufficiently to thank and repay him."

Many more such testimonies might be given, but enough for the present.

Some persons have objected to the order observed by Luther, particularly in beginning with the commandments; but is not this the real order of salvation? "By the law is the knowledge of sin." "I had not known sin but by the law." How proper, then, that after I have discovered myself to be a sinner by hearing the demands of the law, and feeling myself ruined, I should be directed to the way of recovery developed in the Creed—that I should be pointed from Moses to Christ—from the law to the Gospel—from Sinai to Calvary—from the broken and condemning covenant of works to the inviting and saving covenant of grace.

The coherence between the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, which follows, will appear, if we consider the design of the former. It contains the doctrine of faith, and not only in an objective form, (that is, the truth that is to be believed,) but it also teaches subjective faith, that which we are to exercise in the truth, and which justifies. Faith is one of the operations of grace. Grace alone engenders, preserves, and increases it, but as it is a gift of God and to be sought by prayer, it is proper that the nature and benefits of prayer should be considered next. God does not engender immediately, but has established means of grace through which the Holy Spirit operates, increasing faith in the hearts of believers, thereby rendering their lives more holy. Among these means are the sacraments, which very properly follow in the order in which they are here set down. The system of salvation is thus complete—the connection and sequence of the articles are scriptural, answering to the experience of every man who has fled for refuge to the hope set before him.

Both these catechisms have symbolical authority in our church, though they were not written by command of princes or by resolution of ecclesiastical bodies. Luther wrote them of his own private will. They, however, became so universally popular (Matthesius tells us that, even in his own time, more than one hundred thousand copies had been distributed) that they gradually and silently won their way to this high distinction. The *Epitome II.* says: *Et quia hæc religionis causa*, &c. "And inasmuch as the cause of religion concerns the laity and their salvation, we also profess our adherence to the Larger and Smaller Catechisms of Dr. Luther, as they are embraced in his works, and regard them as a sort of Bible for laymen, in which is contained every thing treated of in the scriptures necessary for a christian to know in order to his salvation." The *Declaratio Solida* afterwards adds, "*omnes ecclesiae*," &c. &c. "all the churches of the Augs-

burg Confession approve and receive these catechisms." They are placed in the Book of Concord, immediately after the articles of Smalcald and before the Formula Concordiae. The reason why they are placed in this order, and thus after the Augsburg Confession and Apology, (for they were written before either,) is, probably, because the former were prepared by public authority, and the catechisms, as before stated, were private writings. All these books had attained symbolic authority before the Formula was written, and hence the latter was placed last.

The Smaller Catechism has been used by most of our ministers in this country, in instructing their catechumens, ever since the transplanting of the church. Numerous editions have been published in both languages by various Synods and booksellers, and thousands are disposed of every year. Some liberty has been taken in some of the English translations, which we regard as unauthorized and unjust. We shall mention but one instance. Luther says, that "the Sacrament of the altar is the *true* body and blood of Christ, under the external signs of bread and wine." The General Synod's and even Ludwig's edition most unjustifiably leave out the word *true*, and thus stultify, not Luther, but some other persons! If the Sacrament is at all the body and blood of Christ, which no person denies; it must be his *true* body and blood, and not an unreal or imaginary body. Why, then, not say so? Why mutilate Luther's language, and try to present him in a false light? He is not the first man that has been wounded in the house of his friends. Some additional illustrations have been made to the General Synod's edition which are very good; for example, an argument in favor of infant baptism, and other explanatory notes. One of our ministers has published two elucidations of the Five Principal Parts, (and it has been shown that nothing else in the book can be called a portion of Luther's Smaller Catechism,) of one of which more than seven thousand copies have been sold, and the demand for it is increasing every year.

We observe that the last General Synod appointed a committee "to improve the Smaller Catechism . . . to frame suitable questions to elicit more fully the sense of the answers to the original questions . . . and to improve the collection of hymns."

This we regard as one of the most important works undertaken by the church for many a day—more important, even, in our esteem, than the improvement of the hymn book, which a few years ago excited so much interest and discussion.

Nobody, however, appears to be much concerned about it, and, very probably, the fact of the appointment of such a committee will be news to many. It *seems* to be an easy thing to add a few questions to the catechism, but we look upon it as involving immense responsibility.

We do not exactly know what is meant by 'improving' the catechism, as expressed in the resolution. Any attempt to alter the arrangement, or sense, or language of the original, would be of more than questionable propriety at present; but still we do not mean to intimate that even that might not be done by the united voice of the church. Yet any essential alteration, without the consent of the whole church, would create an interminable controversy, and produce the most disastrous results. But we have no apprehension that the committee design to propose any such thing. We have the highest confidence in their integrity, prudence, and attachment to the church.

As this subject has been brought to the notice of the church, should we not make a complete work of it at once, and endeavor to furnish our people with a catechism that will need no further 'improvement' hereafter? If it were not considered presumptuous, we would beg leave to make to the committee the following suggestions: retain the Five Principal Parts of Luther's Catechism just as they stand, but give the commandments in full, as in the General Synod's edition; "elicit more fully the sense of the original" by additional illustrations drawn from the Larger Catechism: abolish as distinct parts the other portions written, as we have seen, by other men, but employ them as far as you can in expanding Luther's answers; introduce a short chapter on the mode and subjects of Baptism, and such other matters of a similar kind as may be deemed necessary; give us, by all means, a chapter of instructions to the catechist and catechumens—tell us how we may most advantageously teach, and them how they may most profitably learn. Furnish us with an introductory chapter on Luther himself, (we have seen some excellent German editions containing such a chapter); print all Luther's original in large type, so that it may be easily distinguished from your own; mark those questions and answers that ought necessarily to be learned in first going through, with an asterisk, so as to obviate all objection to its size.

No one could reasonably object to this arrangement, for it contemplates retaining all that Luther wrote of the book, and yet does not reject all that he did not write. This would secure unity and a *consequence* of plan, which the book called

Luther's Catechism does not now possess; and if the committee write their portion of it in the same style that Guericke declares Luther wrote his—"in apostolic clearness like that of James, and with practical concreteness," (in apostolisch Jacobischer Klarheit und praktischer Concretheit)—we will say of them, as Matthesius said of Luther, if they had never written any thing else, they will deserve the everlasting thanks of the church.

Abundant materials for such a work are at hand in the immense number of Illustrations of Luther's Catechism that have appeared in past years, and which are yet annually appearing in Germany. We could furnish a catalogue of alarming length, but would particularly recommend certain works on this subject, of the old and modern masters, if it were within our province. On one catechism that we know something about, such men as Carpzov, Lucian, Schmidt, and a few others, wrote, and thought, and prayed five years. Since that time, catechisms have been manufactured with more haste.

This is not the first time that the subject of an "improvement" in the catechism has been brought to the notice of the church. In the fifth volume of the Lutheran Intelligencer, several articles relating to it may be found, some of which, we believe, were written by ourself. But as the Persian prince said, "the remembrance of youth is a sigh." In looking back on those productions of our theological adolescence, we were reminded of what Schiller said when he refused to witness the performance of his play of the Robbers: "Ich will nicht mein Magen verderben mit der rohen Kost meiner Jugend," (I will not turn my stomach with the raw productions of my youth.) No; we trust the committee will not change the form or the words of the original. We trust it will not be in this country with the catechism as it is in Germany, where, as Jerome (quoted by Hase) said of the bibles of his day, "we have so many copies and codices, and every one, just at his own pleasure, either adds or subtracts, as seems good to him." Let them take the copy as given in Walch's edition of the Book of Concord, and they cannot err.

It would be an easy transition from this theme to another of immense practical importance: the benefits of catechetical instruction, including the duty of imparting and receiving it, and the best method of catechising. We do not remember seeing any thing in print on this subject in our church periodicals for some years. One of our ministers some time ago preached an elaborate discourse upon it at a Synod, and he was politely requested, by resolution, to publish it at his own

cost ; but as he had some practical experience of the profits which writers receive from pamphletizing, he declined, as he did not feel disposed to reward the printer at his own expense.

Great as Luther was, yet he was not above receiving lessons from the catechism. In his Introduction to the Larger, he says, "for myself, I can also say, that I am a divine and a preacher—yea, I have as much learning and experience as all those who despise the catechism, and yet I am not ashamed to do as children do who learn it. Every morning, and also at other times, I repeat, word for word, the Decalogue, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and some Psalms ; and although I thus daily read and study it, yet I do not advance as I should like, and hence I must continue to be a child and to be a learner of the catechism ; — to which I cheerfully consent." This reminds us of what Hannah More has somewhere said : "it is a pity that people do not look at their catechism sometimes when they are grown up ; for it is full as good for men and women as it is for children ; nay, better, for though the answers contained in it are intended for children to repeat, yet the duties enjoined in it are intended for men and women to put in practice. It is, if I may so speak, the very grammar of christianity and of our church ; and they who understand every part of their catechism thoroughly, will not be ignorant of any thing which a plain christian ought to know."

But the subject of catechizing demands a separate article, and we will conclude in the language of old Thomas Fuller, which we commend to the consideration of those pastors who express their surprise that some of their parishioners wander away after theological mountebanks peregrinating through the country, and opening a religious "show ;" and to those also who act on the principle that one protestant church is as good as another : "What may be the cause why so much cloth so soon changeth color ? It is because it was never wet wadded, which giveth the fixation to a color, and setteth it in the cloth. What may be the reason why so many now-a-days, are carried about by every wind of doctrine, even to scour every point in the compass ? Surely it is because *they were never well catechised in the principles of religion.*"

ARTICLE VI.

CHRYSTOSTOM CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO TRAINING
FOR THE PULPIT.*

By Rev. Charles F. Krauth, A. M., of Winchester, Va.

ELOQUENCE is older than Rhetoric, and great sermons were preached before homiletical treatises were written. Poets do not go to rhetoricians, but rhetoricians to poets, in the infancy of literary science; nor is it until a highly refined state of society and art has been reached, that they so harmonize as to perform a common and inseparable work. Wherever rhetoric does not base itself upon that which existed and was illustrated before its own origin, it is almost certainly false and affected; so that, useful as it is in its sphere, it can only cease to be dangerous to a pure taste when we constantly appeal from its oracles to that general voice of nature in earlier literature, of which it professes to be the echo. Rhetorical art, which separates itself from examples, and builds up an edifice *a priori*, will not present the general form of nature in which it shines in lovely unity through the great minds of all ages and all lands, but will be the image of one mind, not of mind itself. Nature, when untrammelled most, is most sure to be nature. The earliest writers in every department, therefore, are worthy of close study, because, by an irresistible law of humanity, they give an impress which never ceases to be felt. They determine some of the elemental features of the department in which they labored, forever. All that follow assist in elaborating to a more scientific exactness the art in which they are masters; but the very cause which imparts increasing perfection to their department of thought, renders less clear those

* The principal authorities to which reference has been had in the preparation of this article are the following:

1. *Socratis Scholastici Ecclesiasticæ Historiæ*, Libri VII. Vuolfgango Musculo interprete.
2. *Theodoretii Episcopi Cyrensis Ecclesiasticæ Historiæ*, Lib. V. Joachimo Camerario interprete.
3. *Hermii Sozomeni Salamini Ecclesiasticæ Historiæ* Lib. IX. Vuolfgango Musculo interprete, (Froben. Basilæ MDLVII.)
4. *J. Chrysostomi Homiliæ in Matthæum*, lat. Georg. Trapezuntio interprete.
5. *Ejusd. Homiliæ S. Johannis*, lat. Fr. Aretino interpr. (Basilæ apud Jo. Frobenium, mense Julio. Anno MDXVII.)

fontinel principles from which all the rest is evolved. In a word, every thing human has a beginning, of which the middle is an expansion, and the end a perfection. The beginning, therefore, must be known to appreciate all that follows, and it is the glorious work of true history to lead us from the fountains along the streams of human destiny, or to show us far back that little spring bubbling up, from whose river we are drinking life and joy from day to day. A loving veneration for the past, may, therefore, be the offspring of a keen, just, sympathizing and admiring judgment of the present—may be the child of a reflective philosophy—not of bigotry, bibliomania or misanthropy. It is not profitless to step into the domain of ancient mind, even in its heathen forms; the soft light and unearthly melody of that world of supersubstantial shadows, do not merely enchant, they also exalt. To the christian, still more, has the history of those who founded or gave form to the early church, an inestimable value. It presents a page often splendid, sometimes painful, always instructive. All of us, even those who turn up the eyes of their sanctimonious ignorance at the very name of the “fathers,” are the children of a thousand influences to which they gave rise; we are the legatees of their virtues and their faults, and he to whom the record of their trials, (under the pressure of disadvantages, which would have crushed those who are fondest of sneering at them, into utter nothingness), of their virtues, and of their greatness, has no interest,—is an inflated and heartless sciolist, who can have no more real faith in the progress and

6. *Johannis Chrysostomi Selecta*. Graece et Latine. De Editionis novae consilio praefatus est, et annotationem subiecit Johannes van Voorst. Lugduni Batavorum, 1827—1830. 2 vols. 8vo.

7. *Johannis Chrysostomi de Sacerdotio Libri VI. Ex recensione Bengelii cum Ejusdem Prolegomenis, Animadversionibus integris et Indicibus editis, suasque notas adjecit A. E. Leo*, (Lipsiae, 1834).

8. *The Life of Chrysostom*, translated from the German of Dr. Neander, Professor of Divinity at the University of Berlin, &c. By the Rev. J. C. Stapleton, M. A., F. L. S. &c. (London, 1846).

9. *General History of the Christian Religion and Church; from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander*. By Joseph Torrey. (Boston, 1847, 1848), 2 vols.

10. *Bibliotheca Sancta a Sixto Senensi, Ordinis Praedicatorum, Ex praecipuis Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Authoribus Collecta, et in octo libris digesta, &c. Opus post Sacra Biblia omnibus veram ac sinceram Theologiam profitentibus summopere necessarium. Editio Tertia* (Coloniae, 1586.)

11. *Life of John Chrysostom*, by James Davie Butler, (Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. I. p. 669-792).

12. *Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, viewed as a Preacher*.—From the German of C. F. W. Paniel, by H. J. Ripley. *Bibli. Sacra*, Vol. IV. p. 605-649.

history of man, than he has in the history and progress of baboons. If there be something, yes, if you will, much to prompt a sigh, there is far more to justify the language in regard to the great saints during the whole era of the Fathers, in which he, of a portion of whose greatness we are about to attempt an illustration, speaks of those worthies who had preceded him: "O blessed and happy men, whose names are in the book of life, and who shone like lights in the world! Precious is their memory!"

There is no part of the character and history of Chrysostom which has not interest and value. As a christian, an officer of the church, and a preacher, he has claims of no ordinary character upon our attention. His life, his labors, his sufferings, and his death, were such as to endear him to all holy men. Yet if we would single out that in which lay his peculiar greatness, from which by most direct connection proceeded the lustre of his destiny and the depth of his sorrows—if we seek for that which invested him at once with terror and delight to his own times, and made him an object of affectionate and admiring remembrance to all succeeding ages, we shall be at no loss to find it: the saint and the bishop are outshone by the preacher. That greatness, and yet more the cause of that greatness, possess to every christian minister the highest importance. A well executed developement of the whole circle of homiletical art, as illustrated in this great man, would be a valuable addition to our theological literature. In default of any such thing, or any prospect of it, we present this humble offering to the readers of the *Evangelical Review*.

We shall not aim at any severe precision in the arrangement of our matter, as we glance discursively at the general influences, undetermined at first in their specific object, which the events of after life turned into the current of his oratorical power. We shall also point out the distinct and direct discipline imparted to his mind by education, with the intention, at some future period, of offering the natural sequel to this discussion, by showing what the conjunction of his natural powers and of art made him, and what was the character of that sacred eloquence of which he was a master. Along with these facts, we shall bear in our mind, and occasionally bring upon the surface, the general principles of homiletical science which they illustrate.

The history of Chrysostom would be of immense value did it merely furnish an answer to the question: whether there can be a true spiritual eloquence—whether Christianity extinguishes the fire of genius, or dampens the ardor of imagination,

or crushes the exalted and exalting passions of our nature? Were there no name but his,—had not the first breath of christian eloquence warmed the world through the lips of him of whom it was acknowledged by those who acknowledged not his divinity, that he spake as man never spake — were there not a succession of illustrious and sainted names gilding with a serene but glorious light the period in which they arose,—still would the name of Chrysostom, though it stood alone, as it now stands unapproachable, recall the golden lips on which half a world hung with tearful and breathless interest,—the hand which pointed admiring and repenting thousands to heaven. Eloquence is but the harmony of the external and internal—the marriage of mind and matter—the soul shining in the body—the thought bursting forth through the man—and in Chrysostom we behold the arm hurling the thunder-bolt, which, whether aimed at the highest or lowest, scathed where it fell; one wave of which, in anger, would have been sufficient to call forth the seditious fury of the whole population of Constantinople. We see him, for his fame, chosen in the face of bitter and secret enmity, by the common suffrage of clergy and people, to the highest ecclesiastical dignity of the great Metropolis of the Oriental Church,—stolen from one city by imperial orders, and finding it necessary to retire secretly from another to prevent insurrection. We hear an admiring posterity giving him the name of “golden mouthed,”¹ a title conferred on many, but cleaving to him alone, until the appellation of the orator has displaced the name of the man, and we know him by a title by which he did not know himself. And evidence yet more unshakable remains. We turn to the records of his wonder-working language, which still breathes and burns, and overwhelms with the proofs of his power, and we feel that Christianity, too, has her eloquence and her power. With the voice that thundered over Greece, and turned back the arms of the Emonian leader, with the sunlight tones, before which the dark meshes of conspiracy, which were gathering around the queen of the world, melted like frost-work—there comes the voice, and thrill the accents

¹ “Nomen ab aurato traxit Chrysostomus ore.”

Spagnoli de Mantua, (born 1444.)

Theodoret, Socrates and Sozomen speak of him in about six hundred places, under the name of John alone. And what is perfectly conclusive, Sozomen (L. viii. c. 10), mentions that the title Chrysostom, was given to Antiochus, Bishop of Ptolemais, a rival of John, but says not a word about such a title having been given to him who now, by the acclamation of a world, wears it alone. It obtained currency from the time of the sixth Synod at Constantinople, A. D 680. See Van Voorst 111, 50.

of one worthy to stand by the side of the Athenian and Roman orators, as strong, as sweet, as persuasive as they.

The story of the life of Chrysostom, so far as it mingles with the general current of history, will be best told to the merely English reader, in Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. He who will turn to the thirty-second chapter of that great work, will find, that even that heart which felt so little sympathy with the triumphs of our faith, could not here escape all the inspiration of his theme; and that Gibbon, for once, praises a christian with some of the warmth which is usually reserved for philosophers, atheists, and idolaters. Chrysostom flourished at a period when high powers were demanded. He was born in the year 354, at Antioch, nineteen years before the death of Athanasius, and while the controversy in which he bore so glorious a part was rapidly hastening to its height. He became Lector at Antioch about 370. Ten years later he produced his *Treatise on the Priesthood*. In the year 386, he was ordained Presbyter, and marked this period of his official life by establishing and extending the usage of the western churches of celebrating the birth of Christ on the 25th of December, instead of the 6th of January. He became Bishop of Constantinople, A. D. 397, and four years afterward became entangled in difficulties with Theophilus, the ambitious and wicked bishop of Alexandria who had opposed his election, and who now endeavored to ruin him on the ostensible pretext that he had protected the fugitive Egyptian monks, who had espoused the peculiar views attributed to Origen. The next year he was condemned by the Council at Chalcedon, and sent into exile; and in the year 407, he received from the hand of that Master whom he had served so well, the Crown of Life. The age of Chrysostom may be regarded as the most splendid in the history of the ancient church. There was a constellation of great names, any one of which would have shed lustre on a whole era.¹ To estimate the intellectual tone of a particular period, we must not think merely of those who, in the strictest sense, were cotemporaries, but of all those who flourished about that time, the immediate fathers, the immediate actors, and the immedi-

¹ For brief characteristic touches of the principal fathers by Rapin, see *Buddei Isagog.* &c. p. 578. Chemnitz has given a very elegant and discriminating view of the excellencies and defects of the early christian writers, from the putative period of the Apostolic canons, to the time of Cyril, in his "*Oratio de Lctione Patrum*," prefixed to his *Loci Theologici*, Wittebergæ, 1623. There is also much valuable matter in the fourth book of the *Bibliotheca Sancta* of Sixtus Senensis (Coloniæ 1586), in which he treats of the Catholic expositors of the holy Scriptures.

ate offspring of the age. The age of Chrysostom was adorned by the names of Eusebius Pamphilius, the father of church history and the most learned man of his time; of Eusebius of Emessa, skilled as an interpreter; of Gregory Nazianzen, distinguished for his philosophic acuteness, historic richness, and florid elegance; of the illustrious brothers, Basil and Gregory of Nyssa, the first of whom, by his theological soundness, his academic grace, and profound erudition, won from antiquity, not without reason, the title of "great," and the second for his nervous and close eloquence, and critical exactness, was honored by the Greeks with the title of "Father of the fathers." The christian student has not yet ceased to hold these names in affectionate respect; nor has he forgotten how Ambrose then shed the light of his learning upon the epistles of Paul; nor how Diodorus of Tarsus, Ephraim Syrus, Theodoret, Isidore of Pelusium, and Theodore of Mopseustia, labored not unsuccessfully to unveil the treasures of the word of God. This was the age of Jerome, who has embalmed his great attainments, his noble mind, and his name to eternal remembrance, by his translation of the Bible, and by the commentaries which illustrate it; the age in which Epiphanius and Cyril defended the faith once delivered to the saints. Yet from the ranks of the illustrious men of this classic and brightest age of patristic genius, we at once instinctively single out two, shining with peculiar glory, each clearly raised up by God and having a great work to perform—either, beyond question, the greatest man of his time, had the other not been born; dividing the palm, and if denied by the admirers of the other to be first, conceded, even by them, to be second. The first of those is Augustine, perhaps the greatest theologian who rose in the church between the times of Paul and of the Reformation. In him the light of Evangelical doctrine blazed out with a lustre which the darkness of the tremendous night, about to descend on the world, could not entirely quench, but which flickered up at long intervals, until the giant hand of a monk, whose order bore his name, fixed it high as the heavens and brighter than the sun, to be the star of our sinful race, till the heavens shall be no more. But the divine legation of the other, whose name you anticipate, is no less clear. Around none of the names of christian antiquity cluster more of the purest and most sacred associations of our faith, and in the charm and power of genius, Chrysostom stands first among them all. Sensitive as the church of Rome is in regard to her glory, one of her most distinguished and devoted sons in the sixteenth century, says: "The greatest alike in the familiar

exposition of the homily or the loftier qualities of the sermon, is Chrysostom, to whom the Greek church never had a superior, nor the Latin an equal, nor furthermore, is likely to have."¹ Rising in an age in which a high standard had been imparted to the eloquence of the pulpit by the great number of minds of the highest order, who had consecrated to it their powers, great excellence was required even to maintain a respectable position, especially in cities so cultivated, fastidious and changeable, as those in which Chrysostom labored. It is hard to be known at all in the competition of great minds; it is harder to be great among the great; but to be greatest among the great is a rare, a wonderful and a fearful endowment. Never were the noblest talents entrusted to more faithful hands, than those of the ardent, laborious, and holy man, on whom our eyes are now turned.

The age demanded men like Chrysostom. The fewness and dearness of books, made it necessary that an active and inquiring people should seek a supply for their intellectual and moral wants, almost entirely from oral instruction. There was in the multitude a passionate love of oratory and an excitability under its influences, of which we can hardly form a conception. There existed also a horrible corruption of morals, which had not left the members, or even the priesthood of the church untainted, which seemed to increase every day; and to correct which, required great skill and fearlessness on the part of a teacher of holiness. The church, too, was rent by the insinuating and dangerous heresy of the Arians, the conflict of which *seemed* doubtful, at times, in its issue.—Abilities of a very high order were engaged in its defence; emperors and councils decided in its favor—and had it firmly established itself in the city of Constantinople, the results would have been long and disastrously felt in the church. We have said the issue *seemed* doubtful—and the closeness of this struggle from which the truth hardly came forth victorious, is often appealed to as a proof that the general voice of the church may give its assent to error—for from almost, to altogether, the transition seems to be easy. But to our minds the only fair inference from this portion of the history of Christianity is, that the truth is imperishable—that the Church,

¹ Bibliotheca Sancta Sixti Senensis, 171. Cassaubon speaking of the Commentary of Chrysostom on Isaiah, uses the following language:—"Opus vere aureum Vix puto, ex omnibus scriptis veterum patrum utriusque lingue, opus simile exstare illi scripto, si modo exstaret integrum Tanta pietas, tanta in sacra scriptura eruditio, quam in illo viro animadverto non sinit me eis adsentire, qui neoterica atque adeo unum e neotericis toli vetustati anteponunt." See Buddei Isagoge, &c., Addenda p. 188.

which is its guardian, is founded on a Rock, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. The history of this controversy demonstrates that, however near to extinction God's truth may appear, it never has been, never will be, never *can* be destroyed. If truth be ever driven from the church, it must be driven from the world. As Jesus was as secure of triumph upon the cross as he now is upon his throne—so was the truth of his essential God-head as certain to prevail, when the dark cloud of a vain philosophy seemed about to obscure it forever—as when Christendom, as she afterwards did, acknowledged it by the voice of her assembled Fathers, wrote it in her creeds, and sealed it with the blood of her martyrs. Precisely where the danger, in the fourth century, was greatest, God placed the bulwark of strength against which its waves dashed only to be broken. No opposition was more ardent and effectual than that of Chrysostom; and he lived to see the truth come forth from the furnace, “where one like unto the Son of God had walked with her,” with no trace of the seven-fold flame upon her garment, or on her celestial brow.

The gifts with which nature had endowed Chrysostom, and the training which in the providence of God he had received, were, in many respects, in harmony with each other, and concurred in fitting him for his mission. His parents occupied a high position in society. His father Secundus held an important post in the staff of the chief military governor of the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire. On the side of his mother Anthusa, he was descended from a wealthy and distinguished family. Both his parents were christians.¹ At the early age of twenty, and soon after the birth of her son, his mother was left a widow, in which condition, induced by a tender regard to her husband's memory, and a desire to devote herself wholly to the improvement of her son, she remained to the end of her life. It was at the flame of a mother's piety his own was kindled, and he received the selectest influences of his early life, where many of the greatest ornaments of the church, in all ages, have first felt the power of divine truth. With the names of the mother of Theodoret, of

¹ This has been denied by so distinguished a writer as Fabricius, who was misled by the life of Chrysostom by George of Alexandria, in which he asserts that his parents were heathens, and that at the age of twenty-three he received baptism at the same time with his mother. See *Johannis Chrysostomi Selecta Græce et Latine—de editionis novæ consilio præfatus est, et annotationem subjicit Johannes van Voorst (Lugduni Batavorum)* Vol. II. 56. That his parents were christians before his birth, is clearly stated by Chrysostom himself, as for example in his work *De Sacerdotio*, L. I. § 5. (Lipsiæ, 1834.)

Monica, the mother of Augustine, of Nona the mother of Gregory Nazianzen, and of Anthusa, it were easy, in more recent times, to enumerate those of many through whose influence their sons have been made the glory, not only of the church, but of the world. It was the care of Anthusa, the mother of Chrysostom, that her son should not receive merely the superficial training of the time, which comprised but a smattering of Latin and civil law, but that he might obtain a thorough education.¹ First among his instructors was Libanius, the most accomplished sophist and teacher of eloquence of his age. Thoroughly versed in the philosophy of the Greeks, wielding the weapons of a glowing rhetoric, and of an intricate and keen sophistry,² and passionately devoted to the ancient paganism, Libanius, with all that could promise success, endeavored to poison the mind of his pupil against christianity. This expectation, though sanguine, was destined to be disappointed. Chrysostom had early been led to the Holy Scriptures, the fountain of all true knowledge, and the teachings of a pious mother, could not be rooted out of his mind. His eloquence, which already began to give promise of its future lustre, attracted the admiration of his instructor. We have a letter from Libanius to him when he was yet a young man, in which he praises a panegyric composed by him on the emperor Theodosius and his children. He tells him that after the receipt of his beautiful oration, he had read it to a number of men, who were themselves public speakers, from whom it elicited every expression of astonishment and delight. He congratulates him on the walk he had opened for his powers, and thinks that his eulogy presents the singular happiness of a great theme treated by one every way capable of doing it the highest honor.³ But perhaps there is no stronger proof of the mingled admiration and irritation with which the gray sophist regarded his brilliant pupil than his dying words, in which he declared that he had marked him for his successor, had not the christians stolen him away.⁴

The predominating influence in the education of Chrysostom, was that of the Bible. All his works show a thorough acquaintance with it,—abound in quotation, and are rich in

¹ Of the solicitous care of his mother, Chrysostom has given a beautiful narrative in the Book on the Priesthood, in the passage already alluded to.

² "Contorta et aculeata sophismata." Cicero Acad. 4. 24.

³ Isidore of Pelusium, quoted by Sixtus Senensis. Bibl. Sancta, p. 95.

⁴ Ἐσχαρῶν—snatched him away as booty, like robbers. Sozomeni Historiæ Eccles. (Froben. Basil 1557). L. VIII. c. 2. Van Voorst II. 95.

allusions drawn from it.¹ His instructors in the Holy Scriptures were, first, Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, from whose hands he received his baptism, his commission as a Lector, and his ordination as a Deacon; and afterwards, Diodorus, subsequently bishop of Tarsus. From the latter, especially, he acquired the elements of a simple historical interpretation.² Though the mystical allegory of Origen was so widely admired, we find Chrysostom wholly untainted by its influence, and he remains, by common confession, the great master of ancient commentators, as he is of christian orators. In the retirement of a solitary cavern, he spent two years in committing to memory the whole of the Bible. The Holy Scriptures he declares to be the exquisite balance in which all things are to be weighed—the test by which they are to be tried—the law by which they are to be determined.³ “Great indeed,” he says elsewhere, “is the reward of him who reads the Holy Scriptures; vast is their utility: as Paul himself hath borne witness, saying, (Rom. 15: 4,) ‘whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.’ For in the Holy Scripture is treasured all that can heal the soul: whatsoever can dispel folly, can calm the passions, overcome the desire of riches, raise us above grief and pain, clothe us with strength of soul, or fit us to endure adversity with an equal mind: whatever remedy, in a word, may be demanded, is here to be found.”⁴ “When that which stands not in the Holy Scripture is affirmed, the hearer is ever wavering in doubt; but when the word of the great God comes as a witness, the confidence of the preacher, the assurance of the hearer, are at once confirmed.”⁵ To these sacred oracles he directed the attention of his auditors; he urged them, by an honorable shame as christians, not to show, in regard to the principles of their faith, and the great expositions of them, an ignorance

¹ In this, though not in this alone, Bernard of Clairvaux was like Chrysostom. Of the great Cistercian it was said, that he was so imbued with the language of sacred writ, that, without his intending it, and almost against his will, he was forced to employ its phraseology. He furnishes but the string for those celestial pearls. The eulogistic words in which Sixtus Senensis speaks of him, are equally true of Chrysostom: “Undequaque veteris ac novi testamenti sententiis distincta sunt, ceu gemmeis emblematis, *hæque adeo commodè et aptè insertis, ut ibi nata esse credantur.*”

² Socratis Scholastici Eccles. Hist. [Basilæ, 1577] Lib. VI, cap. II. Sozomen. Hist. Eccles. VIII, 2.

³ “*Ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκριβῶς ζήτων καὶ γνώσεων παντῶν.*” Hom. 13. in 2 ad Corinth.

⁴ Homil. xxvi in Johannem.

⁵ ad Psalm 96.

which no other profession displayed in its peculiar department. No protestant divine more frequently, sincerely, and urgently enforces the reading of the Scriptures by all persons of all classes, than does Chrysostom. On the proofs of this we need not dwell; they are found on almost every page of his writings; and that corrupt hierarchy which honors his name by saintship, and tramples on his principles, does not attempt to deny that the whole weight of his influence is cast in favor of the right of all to read the word of God.¹ And thus this sentiment of his is a real evidence of the powerful influence of this great agency on his mind, and not a blind and ignorant idolatry; for his interpretations are of the soundest character, and his works are full of valuable hints on the general principles of interpretation, and concur with proofs of every kind to show that his acquaintance with them was as thorough as his admiration was deep and unfeigned.²

The influence of the great classic authors of antiquity was the next powerful agency by which the mind of Chrysostom was formed. The great and simple grandeur of their style, the richness of their thought, the high finish of their workmanship, all were felt powerfully by one whose genius was of so kindred a cast. From them, though the corruption of letters was advancing with fearful strides, he derived a language and style which present a natural ease, an unaffected simplicity, a graceful purity, which conspired to raise him to his position

¹ See, for instance, the Dissertation by Fenelon, "on the use of the Bible, with illustrations by Rev. John Fletcher, D. D." [Baltimore—John Murphy, 1847.] Fenelon opens with the candid admission that "many writers have given themselves a very needless degree of trouble to prove what cannot be called in question, namely, that the laity were wont to read the Bible during the first ages of the church. To be convinced of this, we need only to consult the works of St. Chrysostom. Thus, for example, &c. p. 1-4. See Chrysostom's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans. Concio III in Lazarum. Hom. in Joan. XVI. Hom. in Matth. II, in Joan X. Hom. in 1 Thessal. II. In these passages, and others, he contends at large that all, without exception, should read the scriptures; that they are clear to the mind of all, and that they should be translated into the vernacular tongue of all nations. He himself translated, it is said, the New Testament and Psalms into the Armenian language. See Sixtus Senensis, Bib. Sancta, pp. 489-492. There is a very copious citation of the passages in Chrysostom on this subject, to the number of seventy-three, with the assurance that these are but a specimen, in "Flacii Illyrici Catalogus Testium Veritatis," etc. [Lugdun, 1597, pp. 336-345.] Leander Van Ess published a work under the title "Der Heilige Chrysostomus, oder die Stimme der Katholischen Kirche über das nützliche, heilsame und erbauliche Bibellesen. Darmstadt, 1824.

² There is a vast fund of valuable matter collected by Flacius Illyricus on sacred criticism, from Chrysostom and the other Fathers, in his treatise entitled, "Sententiæ ac Regulæ Patrum de ratione cognoscendi S. Literas," contained in the Clavis Scripturæ Sacræ. [Lipsiæ, 1695, II, 121-228.]

as the most elegant and classic of the fathers.¹ He added their stores to the rich ones furnished by his own experience in the great lessons of human nature; and whilst they softened, perhaps, the theoretical estimate which, as a theologian, he might put upon the original and essential depravity of man, which is a doctrine unknown to heathen writers, they furnished overwhelming and mournful evidence of the corruption to which all mankind, in fact, had come. Taught by the Bible, and by these great masters, (often unconsciously its best commentators,) he holds up to vice a picture of its own ugliness, with a power as masterly as that of Juvenal; he paints the conflict of the christian in the glowing hues with which Homer revives the heroes around Troy; he brings out the narrative of the Evangelists with the picturesque grace of Livy, and with the skill of the lesser, though not less pleasing, poets; he gives to his delineations of domestic life a minute finish which makes his works the storehouse of the antiquary as well as of the christian, and conspires to crown him with a varied reputation, as the classic moralist, theologian, saint, painter, and poet of his times.²

He employs the truths of general history, also, with sufficient frequency to show his great familiarity with them. His retentive memory constantly came to the aid of his vivid imagination. It ranged over the whole period of ancient history, from the time of fable to his own age.³ In the annals of the church he was versed in a high degree. He recounts the toils of the saints and the sufferings of the martyrs with a sympathy which kindles in every word, and seems eager to emulate their holy renown.

¹ Sixtus Senens. Bib. Sanc. p. 259.

² Chrysostom frequently quotes from the Greek poets, as for example, from Pindar, from Aratus, to whom he was the first to refer the well known quotation of Paul—Acts, xvii, 8—from Homer, whom he employs frequently in the way of direct quotation and of allusion. He introduces many figures and proverbial expressions from the poets. An ample detail of these is given by Van Voorst, *Oper, Selec. &c.* II, 154-168.

³ For instance, he speaks of the tyrant who in vain commanded Socrates to desert philosophy; of that philosopher going to war; of the expulsion of Plato from Sicily; of Demosthenes at the battle of Chaeronea; of the law of Solon, mentioned by Æschines; of the institutes of Lycurgus regarding the Lacædæmonian virgins; of Xenophon laying aside the crown whilst sacrificing, when he heard that his son had fallen at Mantinea. He alludes to various particulars having reference to Diogenes, Alcibiades, Aristides, Epaminondas and Aristippus. From the fabulous period we have the story of Phœnix, son of Amyntor, told by Homer; the marriage of Œdipus, and others on which we cannot dwell. There are occasionally perversions and anachronisms, in referring to matter of this kind, arising from his extempore delivery. See Van Voorst, II. 168-170.

The mind of Chrysostom was imbued, too, with the better philosophy of the ancient world. He constantly employs for the government of life the Socratic or Platonic precepts, but in a christian form.¹

Among the early and controlling influences of the character of Chrysostom, not only as a man but as a preacher, we are not to forget the monastic life. Having entered with every prospect of a successful and distinguished career on the practice of law, he soon felt disgusted with the artifice and dishonesty naturally connected with that profession in a corrupt age, and cherished an increasing desire to retire from the world and in solitude to consecrate himself wholly to God. Around Antioch were the cells of many monks whose days were spent in devotion and industry, and to their contemplative life his heart continually turned. This disposition was heightened by the fact that Basil, the companion of his childhood, and the friend most beloved in his maturer years, had entered upon this state and was exerting a powerful influence in its favor upon him. It is believed that the opposition of his mother to this step prevented him from taking it until after her death, though during her life he remained almost a monk in his own home. He passed four years in this form of eremitical life, and, with an ardor unquenched, spent two years in complete solitude in a convent, until exhausted nature compelled him to return to the haunts of men.

Fraught as this whole system is, not only with abuse, but in its own nature with manifold evils, it is yet useless to deny that it may, in some cases, be attended by benefits too dearly purchased, indeed, by its dangers, and counterbalanced by too much that is most wicked and revolting, to authorize any apologetic use of this admission. It is certain that the wise and almighty providence of God, which in any mixed influence can neutralize the evil and develop the good, employed it in this case for the production of the happiest results. But it was the monastic system divested of those attributes with which we justly regard it, but rather in a form realizing the pure ideal of its original conception, which formed to so great an extent the character of Chrysostom. It was this life, in *this* form, which he describes so graphically, admires so warmly, and de-

¹ Van Voorst, II. 154-158, 170-182. There is an interesting note in Möhler's *Symbolism*, [New York, 1844,] p. 180, which touches on the comparative influence of the various systems of ancient philosophy, as preparative to Christianity. See also a beautiful comparison of the effects of the Stoic and Platonic philosophies, in Neander's *Church History*. [Philadelphia, 1843,] pp. 18, 19.

fends so eloquently. It was not the sensual and slothful existence which has so often been passed in monasteries that he defends; and the sting of the reproach which ignorance has made against him on account of his admiration and zeal for monasticism, loses all its venom when we recall what was his idea of the true life of the monk: for though a pure christianity shows unto us "a yet more excellent way," this does not prove that the slothful, who know that better path, are advancing more rapidly on the journey of life, than the earnest souls, whose path is more rugged and less direct. Chrysostom's picture is that of men truly detached in heart from the world, engaged in the study of God's word, in meditation, in sacred music and in prayer, laboring diligently with their own hands, engaging in the education of the young, the succor of the distressed, and the relief of the poor. Crucified unto the world, and with the world crucified unto them, they make the pains and trials of the body the joy and strength of the soul.—Weaned alike from the cares and the love of life and the fear of death, they seek the mountain tops, as if they would be nearer heaven,—the wild cavern that they may feel alone with God.¹ They sacrifice the joys of domestic life that they may give themselves to Christ; they renounce the occupations of the world that they may walk in heaven. Often they were weary souls, fleeing like mariners from the tempest, and rejoicing that they had found a haven where their throbbing hearts might be still. With every passion dormant, which worldly cares, griefs, dangers, hopes, or fears might excite, "they sought an abiding kingdom, a city to come, whose builder and maker is God." In the lonely vallies, by the murmuring fountains, in the voiceless wilderness they conversed with God. Far from the poisoned air of the city, and the unhealthy excesses of luxury, pursuing a life, simple, tranquil and systematic, their bodily health and unclogged faculties were in unison with their spirits. Every little garden that sprung up in the wilderness, beneath their cultivating hands became a paradise, the seat of innocence and bliss, where God again walked and conversed with men, but where the tempter appeared only to be driven away with shame. "With the first ray of the morning," says Chrysostom,² "nay, long before day, they arise from their couches, their minds

¹ "Felices nemorum—incolas
Certo consilio quos Deus addidit."

Jean Baptiste Santenil.

² Homil. LXIX. in Matt. (Froben. 1517.)

clear and fully awaked: the aching head, the heart worn with care as far from them as from the angels on high. Their faces beam with the joy and peace which pervade their souls: they come together and their choral song of praise to God rises as from one heart, with one voice; they thank him for the blessings which he lavishes on all, and for those preëminently by which he has distinguished them. Their song floats to heaven, it mingles in one strain with the angels': 'Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will toward men.' Apparelled with a simplicity suited to their characters, and conformed to the example of the prophets, apostles, and saints of old, in their garments of goat-skins or of camels' hair, they now on bended knees implore that they may be guided safely on the path of life, and that they may reach at last the presence of the great Judge on high; and as the morning sun begins to shine, they turn to their occupations for the benefit of the poor. The day is spent in alternate labor, reading and prayer. After their homely repast, they return praise in this song: 'Blessed art thou who hast fed us from our youth, who givest food unto all flesh: fill our hearts with joy and gladness, that ever having sufficient we may abound in all things in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom with Thee, be honor, glory, and dominion, world without end. Glory be to Thee, O Lord, glory to Thee most Holy, glory to Thee, O King! Thou who hast fed us, fill us also with joy and gladness in the Holy Ghost, that when thou renderest unto each according to his work, he may be found acceptable in thy presence, without shame.'"

Such is the picture on which we have dwelt, not only because of the insight that it gives us of the sort of influence exercised on the great christian orator, at a most important period of his life, but also as characteristic of the times—a picture not without beauty, and which Chrysostom had constantly before his mind when he spoke of the monastic life. And if we allow for the hues with which an ardent devotion, assisted by a strong imagination, and expressing itself with the florid graces of rhetoric, would invest it, such was the life substantially, which, as a monk, Chrysostom passed. It is not wonderful that he, and other good men, were enamored of such a life and disposed to estimate its advantages too highly, its dangers too low. The condition of society was extremely artificial, and corrupt to a loathsome degree; the empire was groaning under political oppression and every form of abuse; the indolent, ascetic and contemplative spirit of the east, and the influence of much of the prevailing philosophy, fostered

a tendency to solitude and bodily mortification. But, perhaps, above all, the furious, heartless, and sometimes bloody controversies, equally painful with those which embittered the last hours of Melancthon, and made him die lamenting the rage of theologians, conspiring with the other causes, naturally inclined good men to withdraw from the scenes of active life, and explain, if they do not justify, the tendency of the times. To this life it is certain that Chrysostom was indebted for the ripening of much that was most valuable in his character, and most potent in his oratory. From the reflective habit it formed and cultivated, from the opportunity it gave for thorough self-examining introspection, which is the only mode of obtaining a radical and profound acquaintance with human nature, from the intimacy with the word of God which he there formed, from the simplicity and severity of morals and personal habits so essential to self-control and clearness of mind, which he there cherished, arose much of his power and of his greatness. In the fascinations of Antioch, amidst the allurements of Constantinople, the rival of great Rome,¹ the presbyter and the arch-bishop retained all the features of the lowly monk; and though abounding in wealth, he was still the enemy of personal gratification and the friend of the poor.

Thus at the era of the Reformation, when God called forth from the cloisters, "the man of his right hand," and others who stood with him, he selected them from the place where they had received the best training the times could afford for their work. When Rome sent the pale and hollow-eyed monk to his vigils; when she trained him to beg in defiance of that shame whose dread once overcome leaves man little to fear, she dreamed not that, like the daughter of Pharaoh, her nursing and training were rearing the prophet, who was to speak the word which should fill her coasts with plagues,—who was to lead forth Israel from bondage, and to send the wild waves upon her hosts, to whelm her pride and her boasting in the sea.²

¹ "Urbs etiam magnæ quæ dicitur æmula Romæ,
Et Chæcedonias contra despectat arenas."

Claudian. V. 54, seq.

² Compare the remarks of Prof. Schaff in the "Principle of Protestantism," (Chambersburg, 1845) pp. 48, 49,—a work through which the native land of the author need not feel ashamed to find itself represented on our shores, of which the land of his adoption may well be proud, whose enemies have trumpeted the unquestionable instances of hastiness and almost of arrogance, (even we, who claim to be exceedingly meek, are still curdled a little at the way Milton is spoken of on p. 143), which are to be found in it, but have either not had the taste to discern, or the candor to confess the general beauty, power and suggestiveness which characterize it in a high degree.

Chrysostom, we have already said, was trained for the practice of law, on whose duties he had actually entered with every promise of a successful career. This preparation was not without value to the future preacher and officer of the church. As a source of mental discipline; as an indirect though overwhelming demonstration of the manifold and subtle forms of human depravity; as a commentary on divine law, of which it is the natural though imperfect image, as natural religion is of christianity, the study of law may prove of high value to the minister of the gospel, and its elementary and general principles might, perhaps, be employed with advantage, in all cases, in ministerial education. 'The practical character and skill in business which such an experience was likely to impart, caused the ancient church to set it forth as a maxim, "that, except in places bordering on the infidels, a good lawyer makes a better bishop than a good divine,"' nor has the church, in ancient or modern times, wanted examples of sufficient lustre to give respectability to the paradox.

We have dwelt at length upon the *training* by which Chrysostom was prepared for eminence in the pulpit, because we regard this as a subject whose importance cannot be estimated too highly. It was when thoroughly educated, formed on the highest oratorical principles of his times, at the age of thirty, in the full maturity of his powers imparted by discipline and time, that he became a preacher. Though his mind was of that high order which exhibits greatness even when comparatively untrained, yet Providence added to the richest natural gifts the highest graces of culture. Art harmonized with nature in what was lavished upon him; and one secret, doubtless, of his success was, that he took so high a view of the learning and discipline necessary for the greatest usefulness in the ministerial office. We know, indeed, that there prevails at present, as there has always prevailed among the illiterate, the half educated and the enthusiastic, a tendency to substitute for perfect cultivation an immature vigor, and to imagine that skill, order, unity, harmony and finish are nothing. There are those who, presuming upon their own natural gifts, the warmth of their temperament, or some oracular inbreathing of the Holy Spirit, deride diligence and knowledge, and by "mocking at the terms when they understand not the things;"² secure in their own minds that victory, which igno-

¹ Edinburgh Encyclopedia, art. Christianity.

² The works of Ben. Jonson (Moxon. London, 1846.) The Alchymist—To the Reader. In this preface the great dramatist speaks of those who "commend writers (he might have added, speakers) as they do fencers or

rance and assurance never find it hard to win. These men are shocked at such a term as "the art of preaching," which, they would persuade us, is equivalent to soaring nonsense, stage strutting, and every kind of self-display and extravagance. But the experience of all mankind will prove that these defects are found either in the very illiterate, whose taste is unchastened, in the very young whose blood is still warm, or in those in whom vanity and other passions are easily roused and defy control. True art is not the antagonist of nature, but her child, emulating the parent with a holy love. It is the antagonist of false art and of all affectation; it is the nurse of simplicity, and the sponsor at the baptism which consecrates great minds to their exalted vocation. The object of true art is but the general form of nature stripped of the meanness of the individual and of the sordidness of all particular times, circumstances and influences; the substance without the accidents. Nature only presents beautiful things, but art strives to discover and reveal beauty, to separate what may be confounded—for every beautiful thing has something which is not beautiful, and how many grasp the second when seeking for the first; but beauty is a perfect and unmingled essence. Art struggles after that which is most natural in nature, and when it falls below nature, it is because nature, with a lower aim, perfectly secures her end, while art, with higher aim, can often come no nearer her glorious goal than to give a sigh and drop a tear towards it. As religion in each saint is imperfect, and its most complete revelation is to be sought in that aggregate of spiritual and moral excellence presented in all saints, and that revelation still presupposes something beyond itself and more perfect than itself, its absolute fountain and source of inspiration, even religion itself in its objective, essential and immutable perfection; so the ultimate object of search to art is that whose image is all nature, but which lies beyond nature and constitutes the idea on which all is framed. Towards this it strives without expecting perfectly to apprehend it. Yet imperfect as it feels itself to be, and confesses

wrestlers; who, if they come in robustiously, and put for it with a great deal of violence, are received for the braver fellows.—I deny not but that these men, who always seek to do more than enough, may some time happen on something that is good and great; but very seldom; and when it comes, it doth not recompense the rest of their ill. It sticks out, (here Jonson borrows from Quintilian,) perhaps, and is more eminent, because all is sordid and vile about it: as lights are more discerned in a thick darkness than in a faint shadow. It is only the disease of the unskilful, to think rude things greater than polished; or scattered more numerous (i. e. harmonious) then composed."

with an eloquent beauty, which contributes at once to the highest persuasion of its truth, and to the strongest counter-evidence of it, still true art is an absolute essential in that condition of society in which man has passed from the period of impulse to that of science, and is indispensable to the formation of the highest style of eloquence. In a highly refined social condition, it is absurd to assert that a man can be born an orator. The Indian may utter a wild strain of eloquence, a mingling of oratory and poetry which flames before men whose passions kindle at a touch, and which may exercise a transient power even over civilized man. But we might as well plead that because there is eloquence in the wild gesture and agonizing entreaty of a mother who supplicates you to save her child from the flames, and therefore the lawyer and the minister can be eloquent in their spheres without training. There are momentary circumstances which practically bring back hearer and speaker alike to the position of infant society. The direct plea of self-preservation is the same in every condition of society. Abel was eloquent against the murderous hand uplifted to destroy him, precisely as the most gifted orator, under the same circumstances, would now be; but the moment we step out of the sphere, in which there is a direct operation of the mere instincts, and find ourselves in an advanced and highly complex condition of society, in which one influence in a thousand arises from the character of man as a detached being; we feel that oratory, which must embrace the very picture of the minds and hearts of those addressed, set in the views and passions of him who speaks, must also of necessity exhibit a corresponding advance, and assume a corresponding complexity. The eloquence of the savage transferred, unchanged, to the ordinary sphere of oratory in cultivated society, could only excite contempt and ridicule. It is by a dramatic delusion which transfers us to the scene of his wrongs and the infancy of his social condition, that we admire the records of such eloquence. If a man exercise only the gifts with which he has been born, with which are often confounded, in the crassest manner, the results of culture, his power can only be felt by those who are substantially in the same condition of nature with himself. Men have, in enlightened societies, become orators with comparatively few external advantages, but no man ever became great without any. The difficulties, indeed, under which men of genius have labored, ought often to be counted among their advantages — for what was lost in their education in variety and extent, has been compensated by its greater solidity, their more thorough mas-

tery of it, and by the hardiness and energy of character gained in the struggle by which they force the world to acknowledge their gifts. Yet to relax our efforts to train men for the pulpit on this account would be most senseless. The system of Sparta which caused all weakly children to be put to death, might secure a community composed more exclusively of able bodied men, yet it was a system not only inhuman but impolitic. In the same way, the system of which we are speaking would kill off all the feeble-hearted and timid, to whom the richest intellectual gifts have often been imparted, so that only a few great and hardy spirits might be left. But it is forgotten how many even of this class have utterly failed, and have been reduced to despair by want of the advantages for whose importance we are contending. The few who have gained the haven compel us to hear of them, but the wave of oblivion rolls its monotonous surge over thousands, who in the efforts, alike vain, of feebleness or of strength, were swept away because they had not been taught to swim. The substance of what is commonly advanced upon this subject is, that a great genius, with few advantages, can do more than a great booby with many. This, we need hardly say, is cheerfully conceded, and has always been by the most strenuous advocates of thorough preparation. One of the great ancient masters of oratorical art has said, and any one might have said it, for no one denies it: "*Plus sine doctrina prudentia, quam sine prudentia valet doctrina,*" that is, "better is good sense without learning, than learning without good sense;" but the real question is, whether good sense is better without learning than with it. Natural bone-setters and natural orators, whose claims are in conflict with surgical and intellectual training, may be regarded with a smile by all but the victims of their empiricism. For our part, we are compelled to think with Quintilian:¹ "We should, indeed, congratulate those who

¹ De Institutione Oratoria (Lipsie, Tauchnitz, 1829.) Lib. II. XII. 12. Lib. XI. III. 2. "*Illis quidem gratulemur sine labore, sine disciplina disertis. — Verum illi persuasione sua utantur, qui hominibus, ut sint oratores, satis putant nasci, nostro labori dent veniam, qui nihil credimus esse perfectum, nisi ubi natura cura juvetur.*" — Multo labore, assiduo studio, varia exercitatione, pluribus experimentis, altissimo consilio constat ars dicendi."

Compare Seiler's Grundsätze vom Predigen und andern geistlichen Vorträgen. (Erlangen, 1786), Einleitung, § 9. A low conception of what eloquence is, lies at the foundation of these false views. Let those who imagine that great orators are scattered

"Thick as autumnal leaves that strow the brooks
In Vallombrosa,"

compare their idea of what constitutes an eloquent man with that of one whose opinion is entitled to the highest respect: (Ciceronis Opera omnia ex

are eloquent without labor and without study.—Those may rejoice in their belief, who think that, to be born is all that is necessary to make men orators, but they must excuse the laborious preparation of us who believe that *there is no perfection but where nature is aided by study*.—The art of speaking consists in great labor, persevering study, varied exercise, repeated efforts and the most profound wisdom.”

ARTICLE VII.

REMARKS ON THE STUDY OF PROPHECY.

By Rev. J. A. Seiss, Cumberland, Md.

WONDERFUL is the constitution of man! God has not only made him an image of divine intelligence and holiness, but has also left on him the impress of divine omniscience and eternity. His faculties live through a wider range than that of his earthly stay. In memory he lives over the past; and by a strongly marked characteristic of his nature, he bends forward and takes in futurity. He is indeed too feeble to penetrate far into time to come without divine aid, but the consciousness is strong within him that an infinite futurity is necessary to the full scope and play of his wonderful adaptations. In youngest childhood he already asks what will be to-morrow, and decrepid age still finds his thoughts busied about things to be. Often heedless of the past, and but little concerned to understand the present, he spends the hours contemplating ideal scenes, still hoping that rolling years will give them the reality of truth.

The existence of this propensity to pry into the future, together with the impossibility of having it gratified without divine assistance, furnishes us ground to look for a revelation from God. In none of the other desires which the Creator has implanted in our nature, has he mocked or disappointed us. In giving us appetites for food and drink, he also created the materials with which to satisfy them. In inspiring us with ambition and desires to excel, he has given us a world in which to operate, and placed objects before us well worthy

recens. nov. Jo. Augusti Ernesti. Bostoniæ, 1815. De Oratore l. 28.) “In Oratore acumen dialecticorum, sententiæ philosophorum, verba probe poetarum, vox tragædorum, gestus pene summorum actorum est requirendus.”

our noblest efforts. In giving us domestic and social affections, he made us opposite sexes and ordained the marriage institution to give them exercise. In giving us a disposition to worship, he also set himself before us as an object entitled to our veneration and love. And from the fact that he has given us these strong and restless desires to know what is to come—these hopes and inward longings after the things concealed in the bosom of futurity—we may readily expect that he has also furnished the means whereby these, too, may be gratified. Accordingly, God has blessed us with prophecy.

The prophecy of which we now speak, is not that deep penetration by which ordinary men sometimes anticipate coming events. This is not above the power of natural reason. All will agree when it is asserted, that, for all time to come, the sun will rise and set—the ocean ebb and flow—the wind blow from divers points—and the seasons alternate. But this involves no prophetic spirit. These things are certain to follow from the constitution and established laws of nature, and may be foretold by any who will ascertain these laws. The astronomer foretells every eclipse of the sun and moon for centuries to come, to the very day and hour. But this is not prophecy. It is a matter of calculation based upon the uniform movements of the heavenly bodies. The experienced politician often predicts, with astonishing accuracy, what is about to transpire. Lord Chesterfield described and foretold the French Revolution long before it occurred; Lord Chatham predicted the American war for independence and its success; John Adams related exactly to the Colonial Congress, and Patrick Henry foretold what would be the effect of adopting the Declaration of Independence. But this is not prophecy. All such predictions are made from observations of the common principles which govern human actions. Prophecy is a *miracle*; a miracle of the most remarkable kind; an *intellectual* miracle; a ray of Divine omniscience thrown in upon the human soul. It is an effort of mind far above the most extraordinary effort of unaided reason. It is the declaration, or description, or representation of future things, to which no chain of circumstances was seen to lead, to which no train of probabilities pointed, and which were not to be determined by the operation of any known laws.

Prophecy, like every thing else, has had its counterfeits. It is a plant from whose wide-spread roots have grown many fruitless shoots. The intense desires of men to look into the future, have led to many tricks and queer pretences on the part of the unprincipled and avaricious. The heathen world is

full of oracles and magicians, nor is christendom free from impious pretenders to prophetic inspiration. But when we lay down real prophecy along side of what emanates from such sources, it displays such a præeminent dignity and glory, that no one can mistake it. It is manifest from its own grandeur and excellence. It declares things so unlikely ever to happen, of such vast consequence to the entire world, in such detailed particulars of time and place, and for so many ages to come, that all who examine it must see, that it can be nothing less than a supernatural communication from Him who knew the end from the beginning. All other oracles relate only to matters of minor importance; are supported for gainful traffic or wilful deception; are delivered in detached fragments, and those in evasive terms; whilst some excuse is always in readiness to account for their variations from the events. Real prophecy is one grand whole. It is a connected system; a building all fitted and framed together. Though it was delivered by different men, in different ages and languages, its unity and symmetry are preserved unbroken. All its writers appear like so many tributaries to the one majestic stream, which runs through all time, and loses itself in the ocean of eternity.

Infidels have often spoken of an obscurity in the prophecies of scripture, as fatal to their claims to a divine inspiration.—But so far as any such obscurity exists, it seems rather to support than to invalidate their divinity. If they were as clear as the power of narrative could make them, any impudent usurper might put himself forward; and so far as his agency would enable him to conform himself to their history, might exhibit such a fulfilment as should defeat the very purposes for which they were given. It is a necessary feature of real prophecy, to be obscure and unintelligible in many of its circumstances previous to its fulfilment, and to reserve its complete explanation for the day of its accomplishment. And if the fulfilment of a prophecy will but explain particulars which were previously obscure but evidently in the contemplation of the prophet, it must augment the force of evidence in favor of its miraculous and divine origin. Exactly so is it with respect to the prophecies of Scripture. They are just obscure enough to disguise some of the leading circumstances from those who lived *before* their fulfilment, while they derive from the events explanations satisfying to all who have lived *after* them. Beyond this necessary concealment, there is no disgraceful equivocation—no hiding of the real idea intended to be conveyed. And while heathen oracles were commonly

susceptible of opposite constructions, the Scripture prophecies relating to Nineveh, Tyre, Babylon, and the countries adjoining, together with others respecting the Messiah and the general history of the world, are not even so much veiled by symbolic language as to elude the understanding of the most negligent observers. So that instead of being, what infidels would have them appear, mere riddles intended to puzzle the ingenuity of man, they are real and intelligible disclosures mercifully made from God to us and our children.

I. *Ought Prophecy to be Studied?*

A negative reply to this inquiry, no reader of these pages will be likely to expect. Yet it is sometimes said, that *the study of prophecy either finds a man crazy, or leaves him so*. Whether such observations are intended to characterize as the veriest fools, such men as Bishops Newton, and Sherlock, and Hurd, Sir Isaac Newton, Campegius, Vitringa, Bishop Newcombe, Nolan, and Brickersteth, it is not for the writer to say. Certainly they are not very happily indited compliments to the memory of these great and good men.

By taking our appeal to the arbiters of all moral and theological questions, we shall probably receive some light as to whether prophecy ought to be studied or not. If we turn to the first chapter of the second catholic letter of the apostle Peter, we may read as follows:—"We have also a more sure word of *prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed.*" To take heed to a thing, (*ὑποσχω*), signifies, to direct the thoughts to it—to fix the attention steadily on it—to observe it with deep scrutiny—to follow it as a disciple follows his master. To take heed to prophecy, then, of course implies the study of it, and the diligent pursuit of what it discovers to us as duty. The same proceeding the inspired apostle approves, and declares that it is "*well*" to do so.

If we turn to one of the most remarkable of the prophetic books we will find it prefaced by these words:—"Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear *the words of this prophecy*, and keep the things that are written therein." (Rev. 1: 3.) To read, (*Ἀναγινώσκω*) signifies to know—to recognize—to understand accurately. So that we here have a blessing pronounced by the God of prophecy, upon such as shall study and understand it.

And to say that the study of prophecy is improper and unedifying, also conflicts with other statements from the same holy authority. Paul says, "*All scripture* is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for cor-

rection, for instruction in righteousness." (2 Tim. 3: 16.) And the Savior expressly enjoins, "*Search the Scriptures.*" (John 5: 39). No exceptions are made with regard to prophecy. Nothing is said by way of preference for one portion over another. All is put upon the same foundation. So that whatever we find in the Scriptures, whether law or gospel, doctrine or prophecy, it is all equally entitled to our devout consideration.

But who can doubt the propriety and importance of studying prophecy, when it is considered what overpowering evidence it affords of the Divinity of our religion. These are days of high-handed skepticism. Infidels are at work by organized associations, and by private and personal exertions, to break the hold of christianity upon human affections. It is true that no fears need be entertained of their success. There is no danger that they will ever be able to break the weapons which God has set for the defence of his truth. But still we must be prepared to meet them. Into our hands has come "the faith once delivered to the saints," and it is for us to contend for it against all opposition. In fulfilling this duty, prophecy is one of our strong holds. In this we can take our position with the greatest safety and the greatest power.

God, in his wisdom and goodness, has furnished to every age, just such demonstrations of the truth as are best adapted to the peculiar emergencies they happen to occasion. What could have better authenticated the divine mission of Christ and his apostles, than the miracles they wrought, and to which they appealed? It is not even to be conceived in what *other* way they could have furnished sufficient evidence to convince their hearers of their supernatural power and authority. They might have prophesied, as they also did; but their prophecies could be of no weight or force until after their fulfilment. So that the very best proofs of their divine commission, which the circumstances would allow, were furnished in the numerous, public, and astounding miracles which they performed. These were things which the people could see and feel for themselves. They were proofs tangible to the senses, and established beyond equivocation, that God was with the men who wrought them.

These miracles, as they are recorded by credible witnesses in genuine and authentic books, written about the time when they were performed, still constitute a strong link in the chain of christian evidence. But they are so remote from our own time, and so closely connected with the period of fable and mythology, that they do not now so forcibly impress us. The

lapse of time has tended to weaken their effect. It is different with prophecy. Here, increase of age gives increase of strength; and the further the event is removed from the utterance of the prediction, the more conclusive is the evidence that it originated in Divine inspiration. It is this accumulated and ever progressive force in the argument from prophecy, which makes it the appropriate and peculiar dependence of the church in these latter ages. And if we were even to concede what is demanded by the sophistical Hume to render a miracle credible,¹ we have it here. So many prophecies have been made, that they comprehend nearly all history; and they are being fulfilled every century among all the nations under the sun. The fulfilment of ancient prophecy is getting to be *the experience of all people*; and this highest of all miracles is now being witnessed by more than half the dwellers on the earth. Thus Providence has anticipated the wily objection with which the infidel would fain annihilate christianity, by working a miracle before his own eyes, and before the eyes of all who will look to see it.

Why, then, not study prophecy? Why not take up this weapon which God has given us, and wield it for his glory? As we are to stop the mouth of the gainsayer by giving him an answer for the hope that is in us, why not go out with him, and point him to those silent desolations, which speak and preach so eloquently for the truth of our Scriptures! Why not invite his steps to the barren rocks where once stood the mighty Tyre,—to the debased people of Egypt, to the forsaken ruins of Babylon, and to the miserable degradations of the once glorious Jerusalem, and there read to him what our prophets said so many ages since? Why not sit down and demonstrate to him, as well as we can, how the posterity of Ishmael has been multiplied in the wilderness, their hand still against every man, and every man's hand against them—and how Israel has been removed into all the kingdoms of the earth, where they remain hated and oppressed to the present moment; and thus, as his confidence begins to quake upon its old foundations, also point his thoughts to still more won-

¹ Hume's argument on the incredibility of miracles, is a little like the reason assigned by a certain son of Erin who was convicted of murder, why sentence of death should not be passed on him. "Indeed sir," said the culprit, "I think it very unreasonable and unfair that sentence of death should be passed upon me, when but *two men* swear that *they saw me* commit the murder, and I am sure I can find your honor *fifty men* in Ireland who will swear *they did not see me do it!*" The testimony of the fifty men would just be as conclusive for the Irishman's innocence, as the ordinary experience of mankind would be against the occurrence of a miracle.

drous things that are to be hereafter. We say, why not do this and much more? Is it not a legitimate employment for christian students and teachers to defend their faith? Surely, then, it is right that we should study prophecy.

Even irrespective of the usefulness of the prophetic writings in the argument for inspiration, there are other reasons why they should be studied. They are rich in comfort and edification for the christian's heart. Indeed, we cannot comprehend the scope and glory of our redemption without them.— It is here, only, that we read the grand outlines of God's providence in the world, or learn the real majesty of his counsels of love. To the diligent search and patient study of the humble and devout, a vast landscape is here spread out, filled with wondrous grandeur and surpassing beauty, the horizon of which is fringed with the bright dawning glories of eternity. There is something in prophecy, which, if it be carefully studied, will help to wean us from the world, to place our hearts on heavenly things, and to fit us for an entrance upon pure, uninterrupted, and lasting happiness. At every step there is something to encourage and comfort us under the fatigues and privations of life; to confirm our faith, and to animate our hopes with glorious anticipations. And if at any time we are made to tremble in view of approaching judgments, it is of that salutary fear which leads to greater diligence to "flee the wrath to come." Prophecy also discloses to us such amazing conceptions of God, his majesty, knowledge, power, and holiness, as cannot but help to increase our veneration and awe. It is a heavenly light, revealing to faith and hope many things which are otherwise invisible, and so must necessarily edify and improve those who will study it, in many ways which they cannot anticipate.

Doubtless the student of prophecy will have to encounter difficulties. He will not always find it as clear as light. Peter calls it "a light that shineth in a dark place;" (2 Pet. 1: 19.) and it is not to be expected that every thing will be as plain as open day. In unfulfilled prophecies, as has been remarked, there is a necessary obscurity in many of the circumstances. But all the difficulties in the way of an adequate knowledge of the prophetic Scriptures, are artificial, and of our own creation. They are not to be compared to the obstacles over which the cultivators of other parts of learning are accustomed to triumph. In fact, when we look at it aright, the very obscurities and difficulties which keep so many from looking into the prophecies, are edifying to the soul. It would indeed be hard to tell, whether the glory of God is displayed more in

what he brings out with noonday clearness, or in what he leaves concealed under the surface of ordinary observation. It is a real pleasure to the mind to know that something has been left for it to do. It luxuriates in the exercise of overcoming obstacles, and bringing up the truth from regions which lie beyond the reach of common view. Only furnish to the human faculties the assurance of success, and it is their highest happiness and purest virtue to labor, and to wrestle with difficulties. So the glimmering twilight which hangs over prophecy is in exact adaptation to our nature. There is just light enough to guide, and cheer, and quicken, and excite; and just darkness enough to keep the pride of human speculation within proper restraint, and to make us prayerful and humble. And as God has intended that we shall exercise and cultivate the faculties he has given us, the very study which a correct acquaintance with prophecy imposes, will help to strengthen and prepare them for the study of greater things in another world.

And when we look at the spirit of improvement and patient inquiry which distinguishes the teachers and students of other branches of knowledge, there is reason to be *provoked* to the study of prophecy. See the thousands who devote themselves to mathematics, astronomy, natural history, literature, and the arts, with what untiring assiduity they labor in their several departments! "They aspire (says a cotemporary Journal,) not merely to be respectable, but to be eminent. They believe in the possibility, not only of mastering what others have learned, but of advancing their several branches to a higher perfection; and they shrink from no toil, they hesitate at no expense, that may contribute to that end. They dig into the bowels of the earth to ascertain the nature and position of its rocks, detect the relics of its former inhabitants, and deduce, if possible, the process of its formation. They visit the remotest isles and continents, traverse wildernesses and deserts, and penetrate into the regions of eternal frost, to observe the different aspects of the world, and learn the nature of its productions. They hunt every inhabitant of the air, and land, and sea; delineate their forms, and note their peculiar habits. They draw every tree, shrub, plant, and flower, assign to them their several orders, and ascertain their uses. They exhaust all the resources of science and art in the construction of instruments to extend their researches into the works of God beyond the limits of our orb. They penetrate into the fathomless heights and depths of space; watch the motions of every planet; mark every star; and learn to resolve their complicated

phenomena into their proper laws. Every accession to their stock of knowledge is hailed with enthusiasm, and raises the discoverer to conspicuity and honor. The detection of a new element in the mineral or vegetable kingdoms; the verification of some great law of matter; the discovery of a new planet, resounds throughout the civilized world, and quickens the pulse of whole nations with exhilaration. The students of geology, chemistry, of the animal and vegetable worlds, of the higher branches of mathematics and astronomy, present in this relation a spectacle of intellectual and moral grandeur, that has scarce a parallel. What untiring application! What exhaustless ingenuity in the invention of instruments; in the detection of principles; in the solution of perplexing problems! What a lavish expenditure of wealth; and with what noble aims and results! the mitigation of the physical evils with which our race is smitten; the easier production, multiplication, and the improvement of the means of subsistence; the creation and higher perfection of engines by which man is relieved from exhausting toil; the advancement of the arts which minister to comfort and refinement; the enlargement of our knowledge of God and his empire! And what splendid successes have attended their labors! They have added larger accessions to the circle of useful knowledge during the present century, than had been contributed by their successors for ages. And to what is their success owing? Not to the absence of difficulties; not to a freedom of the great subjects they have investigated, from intricacy. No problems that ever tasked the faculties of man, demand a loftier grade of powers, a larger grasp of intelligence, a greater patience and persistence of application, than the higher questions of astronomy. Their success is the fruit of their genius, faith, and hope; the result of indefatigable industry; the reward of gigantic exertions." (See Lord's *Theological and Literary Journal*, p. 5.)

With such examples of intellectual effort, daring, patience, fortitude, hope, and success before us, how can we remain indolent? Are the themes of Scripture so barren, the science of Theology so perfect, the territory of Revelation so thoroughly explored, as to render further efforts fruitless; What field exhibits more grandeur and promise than prophecy? Like the goodly land to the lonely beholder on Mount Pisgah, it spreads itself before the christian student, and lengthens on in increasing glory beyond the utmost stretch of vision. He only needs the courage and enterprise to cross the Jordan of his own carnal indifference, and his face will be made to shine with the oil of its olives, and his heart to rejoice with the fruit of its vines.

And if others can find pleasure in the wilderness, shall we not be able to find it in Canaan? If so much is to be accomplished by the study of rocks, and beasts, and birds, and stars, why not up, and show the world the sublime facts, the beautiful laws, and the transporting schemes of that Providence which prophecy unfolds?—The Lord have mercy upon us for our neglect of his word! and rebuked by the achievements of men in other departments of intellectual effort, may his Spirit guide our way as we for the future apply ourselves more to the prophetic Scriptures!

II. *What are the Rules for the proper Interpretation of Prophecy?*

First, we must approach it with a deep sense and humble acknowledgment of our weakness and ignorance. This, indeed, is essential to success in every inquiry which we may undertake. "It is one part of science," says Dr. Good, "and not the least important part, though the lowest and most elementary, to become duly acquainted with the nature and extent of our ignorance upon whatever subject we propose to investigate." (Book of Nature, p. 322.) Especially is this qualification requisite to the successful investigation of prophecy. Disappointment and disgrace will be the inevitable portion of him who ventures upon this exciting ground without knowing his own heart. We must understand our weakness and proneness to stray from the truth, or we shall be in danger of being carried off with crude and confident theories which will subject us to the ridicule of the intelligent, and cover us with confusion and shame, if not drive us to skepticism. The voice of history with respect to this point is too plain to be mistaken.

Second, we must come to the study of prophecy with a reverent, believing, submissive, prayerful heart. The reason for all this is, that we are about to deal with the word of Almighty God—the word upon which our eternal destinies depend. There is no room here for witticism, caviling, or foolish speculation. We must bring to this investigation a pure and sober mind, free from erroneous anticipations, and prepared to lay hold of every thing which the prophetic scriptures contain. Our eye must be single and pure, not distorted or shaded by men's opinions. However foreign to our preconceptions the truths which we learn may be, we must be ready to admit them and submit to them. And in our whole progress, we must look for the illumination of that Spirit which first indited them, and which is able to guide us into all truth.

Third, we must bring to the study of prophecy a suitable share of lingual, archaeological, geographical, and historical information. The prophecies were written in languages foreign to us, and which often exhibit peculiarities and shades of meaning which our version does not express. It is hence necessary that we have some knowledge of these languages. They were also written in ages whose customs, habits, laws, and institutions differed materially from ours; and without an acquaintance with these we cannot interpret the many allusions to them which the prophecies contain. They refer to different regions and places in the world, and contain many figures drawn from local objects; and hence some acquaintance with geography is needed. Whilst without a knowledge of history we cannot decide what prophecies are fulfilled or unfulfilled, and will be totally unqualified to trace out those wonderful verifications which the Scripture predictions have had, and are every day having in the world. Moderate attainments with respect to these branches will enable us to enter upon the study of prophecy with profit; but the more deeply we are versed in them, the greater will be our success.

Fourth, we must be careful to assign to the prophecies their proper scope and latitude. Solid objections may probably be urged against that mode of interpretation which allows of a *double sense*. But it is not to be successfully controverted, that some prophecies do consist of a certain scope which stretches beyond the simple meaning of the words in which they are delivered. Lord Bacon says, there is a "latitude which is agreeable and familiar unto Divine prophecies, being of the nature of the author, with whom a thousand years, are but as one day, and therefore they are not fulfilled punctually at once, but have springing and germinant accomplishments throughout many ages, though the height or fulness of them may refer to some one age." (Adv. of Learn. book 2.) In illustration of this, reference may be taken to 2 Samuel, seventh chapter, where God promises to David a son who should build a house for the divine glory, and whose throne and kingdom should be forever. This prophecy evidently had a "*germinant*" fulfilment in the person of King Solomon; but Paul (Heb. 1. 5.) finds its highest and ultimate fulfilment in the person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ. So also in the prophecy contained in the 24th of Matthew. Here we have a single prophecy apparently referring to one single event; but some parts of it cannot be limited to the single destruction of Jerusalem, while others cannot be carried forward to the end of the world. It cannot, then, be satisfactorily explained,

but by assigning to it that "*latitude*" which will take in Christ's *providential* coming to destroy the Jewish polity, and his *personal* coming at the close of time. And agreeably to this we may also translate his own declaration, "Verily, verily, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be (not *fulfilled* as our version has it, but) *fulfilling*." This peculiar scope in the prophecies of Scripture, is thus beautifully set forth by a popular living writer: "The prophecies of Holy Writ appear to me to have one great peculiarity, distinguishing them from all other prophecies, if any, real or pretended; and that peculiarity I deferentially conceive to be this; that whereas all human prophecies profess to have but one true fulfilment, the Divine have avowedly many fulfilments. The former may indeed light upon some one coincidence, and may exult in the accident as a proof of its truth; the latter bounds as it were (like George Herbert's Sabbaths), from one to another, and another, through some forty centuries, equally fulfilled in each case, but still looking forward with hope to some grander catastrophe. It is not that they are loosely suited, like the Delphic oracles, to whatever may turn up, but that they, by a felicitous adaptation, sit closely into each era which the Architect of Ages has arranged. Pythonic divination may be likened to a loose bag which would hold and involve with equal ease almost any circumstance; Biblical prophecy to an exact mould, into which alone, though not all similar in perfection, its own true casts will fit. Or again, in another view of the matter, accept this similitude; let the All-seeing Eye be the centre of many concentric circles, beholding equally in perspective the circumference of each, and, for accordance with human periods of time, measuring off segments by converging radii: separately marked on each segment of the wheel within wheel, in the way of actual fulfilment, as well as type and antitype, will appear its satisfied word of prophecy, shining onward yet as it becomes more and more final, until time is melted in eternity. Thus it is, perhaps, not impossible that every interpretation of wise and pious men may alike be right and hold together; for different minds travel on the different peripheries." ("An Author's Mind," p. 92.)

Fifth, where the language is not evidently symbolical we must take the literal meaning. If we examine those predictions which have already been fulfilled, we shall find an exact correspondence between the fulfilments and the very letter of the predictions. Every thing relating to the overthrow of Babylon, Nineveh, Tyre, Edom, Jerusalem, and to the dispersion of the Jews and the lost ten tribes, is amply shown by

Bishop Newton and Mr. Keith, to have been fulfilled in most precise agreement with the plain words of the prophets. The same is true with respect to those prophecies which set forth the first Advent of our Lord. From these we may then draw the *rule*, according to which to apply ourselves to other prophecies proceeding from the same spirit, and in many cases through the same men. "I would have a preacher explain the Scriptures with connection," says the Archbishop of Cambray, "*according to the obvious sense of them.*" (Dial. Conc. El. p. 191.) "Few things," says Bickersteth, "have occasioned more perverted views than the figurative interpretation of plain expressions. It has thrown away much of the prophetic use and instruction of lengthened and important predictions." (Prac. Guide, p. 15.) and Hooker, usually called "the judicious Hooker," somewhere declares, "I hold it for a most infallible rule in exposition of sacred Scripture, that where a *literal* construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst. There is nothing more dangerous than this licentious and deluding art which changes the meaning of words, as Alchemy does or would do the substance of metals, makes of anything what it lists, and brings in the end all truth to nothing."

Sixth, where we discover symbols, we must interpret them as the real and inspired representations of the things for which they stand. For example, it is said in Daniel, (8: 20.) "The ram which thou sawest having two horns, are the kings of Media and Persia; and the rough goat is the king of Græcia." By this we understand, that the two-horned ram is the symbol of the Medo-Persian empire, and that by consequence every thing characteristic of that animal, and all that the prophet saw him do or suffer, is to be interpreted of that empire: that the rough goat is the symbol of the Grecian empire, and that by consequence all the distinctive qualities of such an animal, and all that was seen of his doings and fate in the vision, is to be understood of that empire. Again, it is said in Revelation, (17: 18.) "The woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over all the kings of the earth;" i. e. this prophetic woman is the symbol of a certain city or community, and we must understand all that enters into the description of her, including all her acts or end, as delineating that community. In the same way we must take and interpret every prophetic symbol, its name, its description, its characteristics, its acts, its everything, as the exact and Divine representation of the object or objects for which it stands. Just as every movement and utterance of the dramatic performer on the stage, is

intended to display the character in which he appears; so the qualities, badges, acts, and fates of the scripture symbols must be received as setting forth the things in whose stead they appear upon the prophetic pages. And unless we are particularly careful to preserve for them this character, it will be impossible to arrive at the clear and satisfactory interpretation of the prophecies.¹

Seventh, we must accurately note the hints which are given by the Scriptures themselves. Most of the prophetic visions, parables, and symbols, have some little explanatory declarations connected with them, which serve as way-marks to guide us to their right interpretation. Thus, in explanation of Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones, it is said, "These bones are the whole house of Israel." By way of interpretation of Daniel's vision of the four terrible beasts, it is declared, "These great beasts are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth." And to unravel the mystery of John's vision in the first of his Revelation, it was told him, "The seven stars are the angels (*ministers*) of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks are the seven churches." And the same sort of hints and helps are thrown in with nearly all the Scripture prophecies. They are like keys tied along with their respective locks; and if we will only lay hold of them, and put them to their proper uses, we shall gain access to much which would otherwise be totally inexplicable.

Eighth, we must consult and compare the best human interpreters. Some may be disposed to object to this rule.—They would have us depend solely upon our own investigations. But why thus go back to begin where our fathers started, when we might be advancing so far ahead by the solid advantages which they can afford us? Why take our stand so low down as they stood when we may stand upon their shoulders? Why fly off to stumble and often to fall, it may be, at last, to rise no more, when we might be led safely and securely by their paternal hands? It is not said that we should always adopt their opinions, or that we should at any time receive their views without investigation; only that we should consult and compare them. They will certainly bring us by shorter ways to the great questions with which we shall have to grapple, and in many instances furnish us no small amount of assistance to decide them. There is scarcely one

¹ Those who wish to see this rule of prophetic interpretation demonstrated, and to witness the important results to which it leads, will be gratified by examining the recent publications of *David N. Lord*.

of them who has not made some discovery worth knowing; and every stroke upon the rock helps something towards breaking it.

Finally, we must make it the chief aim in this study, to improve and edify our hearts. Prophecy is not designed for the simple gratification of curiosity respecting what is to be. Nor will the mere speculative understanding of its meaning be of any essential service to us. Its main purpose is, to exercise and try our christian graces; to encourage our hopes; to strengthen our faith; to prepare us for times of suffering by timely warnings of their approach; to increase our patience and zeal with assurances of ultimate triumph and blessedness; to sanctify and make us ready for our inheritance. We are to study it with a view to be made better and happier; to become more heavenly in our thoughts and temper. There is a blessing pronounced upon those who understand, hear, and keep the sayings of prophecy; and for that blessing we should seek.

It is probably the greatest failing of the christians of this generation, that they are too speculative in their study of the Scriptures. They examine them too much for the establishment of philosophical theories, or the trial of old creeds, to the neglect of the practical wants of the heart. We hear them crying out, "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible." The shout is echoed from house to house, "The Bible is older than the fathers — truer than tradition — wiser than councils — more learned than universities — more infallible than popes — more authoritative than priests — more powerful than ceremonies — and more reliable for the world's salvation than any or every thing under the heavens!" But how often is that blessed Book degraded into a mere polemic manual from which to draw themes for learned theological harangues, or questions for low and angry debate! It is not that we are heterodox, but too undevout; not that our minds are not busied on holy themes, but that we do not embed them in our souls, and wrap them up in the warm embrace of our affections. Let us read now a confession from one who long shone as a star on earth, but has lately faded into the brightness of heaven. And as we read, let us vow to God to be more practical and devotional in our Scripture studies. — "I have all my life viewed the truths of Christianity too much in the way of speculation, and as if at a distance from the objects of it. I have not closed with them; I have not laid hold of them; I have not appropriated them. I have been persuaded of the truth of the promises; but not embraced them.

With the exception of an occasional gleam of light and comfort from the freeness of the gospel, I have had no steady, habitual, personal sense of that freeness. I have abundantly acknowledged it, but have not used it. And where is there, then, any evidence to my consciousness, beyond that of a liking and a recognition for orthodoxy, and a general or vague earnest of my being personally and practically, and in very deed, a disciple of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ? O, my God! confirm my faith, give point, and reality, and decision to my purposes. May the transition from nature to grace be actually undergone by me. Work in me faith with power; and trusting in Christ, may I receive the Spirit as the earnest of my inheritance. It is quite obvious that I do not pray enough; do not depend enough; do not enough break loose and away from the routine of my daily engrossments. Bestow upon me the grace of supplication, O God!" (*Chalmers's "Horae Biblicae Quotidianae,"* Vol. I. p. 38.)

ARTICLE VIII.

SCHMID'S DOGMATIK OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

Die Dogmatik der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt von Heinrich Schmid, Dr. Phil. und Lit. Th. Privatdocent und Repetent an der Universität Erlangen. Zweite Auflage. [The Dogmatik of the Ev. Lutheran Church exhibited and authenticated by references to the sources: by H. Schmid, Dr. Ph. &c. &c.]

THE highest interest attaches itself in the present state of theological opinion in the Lutheran church of the United States of America, to a work whose professed object is to furnish a comprehensive and candid statement of the doctrines which characterized the mother church in Europe, during the earlier and purer periods of her history. It may be saying much, but the presumption is, not too much, to assert that there are thousands who call themselves by the name of the venerable Luther and glory in him as a great instrument in the liberation of the church from Romish bondage, who have no correct views either of what he taught, or what was taught by his immediate associates. Both clergy and laity are, in our country, to a considerable degree ignorant of the system

which preëminently distinguishes the Lutheran church, and particularly as it is exhibited in the Symbolical books and the writings of the eminent divines who remained faithful to those books in their exposition of Christianity. This is the less surprising, as it is undoubtedly true that in Germany itself, abounding in literature which is derived from the fathers of Lutheranism, in consequence of the prevalence of Rationalism and forms of Supernaturalism, exceedingly remote from the primitive Lutheran faith, there has been far less familiarity with the doctrines held by the founders of the church than might reasonably have been expected. The revival of these views, their adoption by some men distinguished alike for piety and an evangelic spirit, their propagation in a modified form beyond the proper pale of Lutheranism, and their introduction into antagonistic communions, have powerfully tended to elicit inquiry in regard to them, and to make welcome any faithful exposition of them which may be offered.

The interest in this system is increased in our country by the notorious fact, that there are now in the United States, men, exercising the functions of the ministry, and their number is increasing, men of talent, learning and piety, who regard the doctrines of the Symbolical books, not only as the truth of God, but likewise as constituting the system which can alone entitle him who receives it to regard himself as a Lutheran. Under these circumstances, it is certainly a matter worthy of curiosity to know what our fathers held and taught, and to make ourselves acquainted with the results at which they arrived in their study of the word of God, and the history of the Redeemer's church. To all who feel such a curiosity, there is an opportunity offered by the author before us of gratifying it. The volume is a moderate sized octavo, containing upwards of 500 pages, and is designed to set forth unadulterated Lutheranism; to display it in its primary and most distinctive features; to represent it as it was before it became modified by influences which changed its original aspects until, apparently, it was finally destroyed by speculation and unbelief. The plan of the author contemplates the exhibition of the entire system of Dogmatik as it appears in the church symbols and treatises of the earlier divines; and he stops at the period when innovation in the system first appears. "The Theologians," he says in his preface, "that I have used as the basis of my statements are, Melancthon, (*loci Communes theologici*, 1543.) Chemnitz, (*loci theologici* ed. Polycarpus Leyser 1591.) Gerhard, (*loci theologici* ed. Cotta, 1762-81.) Hafenreffer, (*loci theologici* Tübing. 1709.) Hutter,

(Compendium theologiæ 1610.) Calov, (*Systema locorum theologicorum* Vit. 1655-77.) König, (*theologia positiva acroamatica*, Rost. 1664.) Quenstedt, (*theologia didactico-polemica*, Vit. 1685.) Baier, (*compendium theologiæ positivæ*, Jen. 1686.) and Hollaz, (*Examen theologiæ acroamaticæ* ed. Teller, 1750.)."

With this design the execution is conducted in the following manner: A condensed summary of the contents of each division of theological science is given in the German language, studded with numerous references to the symbolical books, and the standard divines embraced in the period within which a rigid orthodoxy flourished. First the prolegomena are presented, which treat, Chap. 1st., of Theology in general; 2d. of the object of general theology—that is, concerning religion; 3d. the source of theology, viz., revelation; 4th. concerning the sacred Scriptures; 5th. the articles of faith and the symbols of the church. The 1st part, chap. 1st, treats of God, the 2nd of the Holy Trinity, the 3d of Creation, the 4th of Providence, the 5th of Angels. The second part treats of man; chap. 1st, the state of integrity, 2d, the state of corruption. Part third treats of redemption, very fully in the various details, in three chapters, of which the 1st unfolds the benevolence of God the Father, towards fallen man, in restoring and rendering him happy; the 2d, the merciful redemption wrought by Jesus Christ; and the 3d, the grace of the Holy Spirit in the application of redemption. The fourth part contains a discussion of the means of grace, and this divides itself into three chapters, in which are handled the word of God, the sacraments as means of grace, and the doctrine in regard to the church. The fifth and last part unfolds the novissima, or last things, and presents under as many different heads, death, the resurrection of the dead, the last judgment, the end of the world, the punishment of the wicked and the reward of the righteous. In addition to the classic divines already mentioned, as sources of illustration or proof, the author refers to the Augsburg Confession, the Apology for it, the Smalcald Articles, the Larger and Smaller Catechisms of Luther, the Formula Concordiæ, and the Examination of the Council of Trent, by Chemnitz. That the reader may have a better idea of the manner in which the subjects are treated, a few extracts will now be given.

In § 40, 3d part, 3d chapter, the following language is held:—"In the doctrine concerning the appropriation of salvation through Christ, the first inquiry will have respect to the means by which we can make it our own, and afterwards the

mode in which it is effected. The means are faith, the mode is justification. Both are acts of divine grace, and therefore both are embraced under the head of 'The grace of the Spirit applying salvation.'

§ 41. 1. *Faith.*

"Reconciliation with God being brought about by Christ's instrumentality, inasmuch as he has, in man's stead, obeyed the law and made satisfaction for the sins of the world, salvation is preached and forgiveness of sins is offered, (Luke 24: 47. Acts 2: 38. 5: 31. 10: 43. 13: 38. 26: 18.). Its reception does not require any meritorious work from man, for Christ has done all that is necessary for its obtainment, and all that is required is, that the proffered salvation should be received, the offered forgiveness appropriated in the exercise of faith.¹ This faith is subsequent to the offer of salvation and the perception of what is consolatory in it, and the confidence that this salvation is designed not for others, but for us—a gracious message being profitable only under a conviction of its truth and its applicability to us.²

Faith consists of the following parts:

1. *Knowledge*, particularly of the articles of faith—such as Christ and his merits and the grace of God, a remission of sins and salvation obtained thereby from God. Br.³

2. *Assent*, that is, the mind approving as most certainly true, and simply to be acquiesced in those things which the Scriptures teach concerning Christ and his merits and satisfaction for our sins, and the grace of God and promises of the gratuitous remission of our sins for Christ's sake.⁴

3. *Confidence*, an act by which the will rests in Christ the Mediator, a present good to us and the cause of other blessings, viz. the remission of sins and eternal life. Br.⁵

Neither of them can be absent and neither alone makes the faith of which we now speak.⁶ Faith requires an actual acquaintance with the promises; and a blind and implicit faith is not sufficient, (such as says what the church believes, it believes), but the faith must be intelligent.⁷ Faith, further, does not consist in receiving and regarding as true, what is promised, with which there may be a perfect indifference to the truth, (historical faith,) and it is therefore not sufficient to regard simply as true the preached gospel. A general assent is likewise deficient, (a belief in general, that God is just and merciful, and has sent his Son into the world as Redeemer, but without specific application, James 2: 19). It must be special, (the sinner determining that the general promises ap-

ply to him individually.⁸) Finally, salvation is not secured unless it is embraced with confidence and self-application; indeed, this is to be regarded as the most essential element of faith.⁹ Faith is, therefore, the assured confidence of an individual, entertained to a greater or less extent, that he is authorized to rejoice in the salvation of Christ.¹⁰ Such a faith is called special, and saving or justifying,¹¹ and is the only means of salvation.¹² Such a faith is not the product of human power, for the alienation from God natural to man, can be removed by God alone, and therefore faith is of God's working in us,¹³ and the word and sacraments are the means which he employs in conducting men to this faith.¹⁴ If, then, faith is nothing but a divinely wrought confidence in the salvation of Jesus, it does not follow, that the man who is the subject of it, has not undergone a moral change, this is indeed to be presupposed, as salvation would not be received which did not offer comfort, and this comfort implies knowledge of sin and hatred of it; so that where this faith is, there is a holy disposition,¹⁵ which is so necessary, that its absence discredits the faith, indicates that salvation has not been appropriated; (saving faith is true and active and not false and dead,¹⁶).

This, however, is to be observed, that, although faith cannot be conceived of without religious affections, these are only the attendants of it; that salvation depends on faith alone, and that holy dispositions are in no wise to be regarded as the cause of it. Finally, as we have means of determining whether we have true faith, it can certainly be ascertained whether we have justifying faith.¹⁷ It may be denominated weak or strong as the confidence of salvation partakes of the one character, or the other.¹⁸

¹ HOLLAZ. The satisfaction has long since been rendered, but its effect, which is the remission of sins, we do not obtain until we apply to ourselves the general atonement of Christ and make it our own by faith. "For that acceptance (pardon) may be gratuitous, the agent ought to design, by what he does, to communicate some good, and the recipient ought to manifest his willingness to receive it. Its communication to an unwilling person is absurd." Puffend. 1. d. N. & G.

BAIER. Although the passion and death of Christ presented all that could be required, in the way of satisfaction from the world, to abolish the debt contracted by its offences, to appease God and to bring about a reconciliation with him; God desired, that sinners should know and appropriate by faith that satisfaction which was made to him by the Son of God in their behalf, and this he desired that in the exercise of faith in the Mediator, there should be an enjoyment of his merits. Faith, in this sense, is subjective, viz: that which believes, (faith, strictly speaking, which is in a believer as its subject,

and is distinguished as such from an objective faith, viz.: that which is believed); this is the doctrine of faith, which is figuratively called faith, because it is the object of faith. Acts 6: 7. 13: 8. 16: 5. Rom. 12: 6.

² APOLOGY for the Augs. Conf. 2. 48. The faith which justifies, is not merely historical knowledge, but assent to the promises of God, in which remission of sins and justification are freely offered through Christ. Lest any one should suppose that it is mere knowledge, we add, further, it is willingly to receive the proffered remission of sins and justification.—81. Thus are we reconciled to the Father and receive pardon, attaining thereby confidence in the mercy promised in Christ.

CHEMNITZ. 1. The Scripture calls faith knowledge and science, Luke 1: 77. Col. 2: 3. Ephes. 3: 19. To faith must be presented and upon it enforced, from the word of God, the decree and history of redemption, the gratuitous and universal pardon, and that God, on account of that victim, desires to receive sinners who betake themselves by faith to him. 2. Because many who hear these things and understand and know them, either neglect, or doubt, or resist, turn away from or oppose, it is necessary that assent should be united to this knowledge—not merely general, but that firm persuasion which Paul calls assurance,—and every one should determine that the universal promise belongs specifically to him, and that he is included in the general promise. 3. After this knowledge and assent (which is in the mind) the heart or the will, under the Spirit's influence, groans and desires, and feeling earnestly the burden of its sins and the anger of God, it desires and seeks that the mercies offered in the Gospel may be granted it. 4. When, in this way, the mind, the will and the heart, are turned from sin and the anger of God, and directed to the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world; that is, when from the sentence of condemnation, denounced by the law of God, recourse is had to a throne of grace, and the propitiation which our heavenly Father offered in Christ's blood, it is necessary to superadd confidence, which relies securely on the divine promise, that the promises of grace will now be applied, and in this way justification be effected, and eternal salvation obtained as gratuitously promised in the Gospel.

³ BAIER. Belief can only take place in regard to those things which are mentally conceived or embraced in simple apprehension. Hence knowledge is commonly regarded as the beginning of faith. That knowledge is necessary to faith in Christ, is proved by John 6: 19. 17: 3. Luke 1: 77. Acts 17: 23. 30. Ephes. 4: 18. Gal. 2: 9.

⁴ QUENSTEDT, (IV. 283.) The second act of faith, viz. assent, is more distinctive than the first, (viz. knowledge,) for heretics may have knowledge and yet not assent. Assent is not slight, doubting, vacillating, but should be decided and strong, on which account it is called *the evidence of things not seen*, Heb. 11: 1. Its basis is not ordinary evidence or knowledge of causes and properties, but the infallible authority of God in his word.

⁵ HOLLAZ. Confidence is an act of the will, by which the sinner converted and renewed, earnestly desires and seeks the mercy of God, secured by Christ's merits, and embraces him both as a present good and as the cause.

of the remission of sins and eternal salvation, and securely reclines and rests upon him.

QUENSTEDT, (IV. 284.) Thus confidence is nothing but the apprehension of the merits of the God-man, appropriating them to ourselves individually. These passages furnish intimations concerning it: John 1: 5. 12. 17: 8. Rom. 5: 18. Gal. 3: 14. Luke 8: 13. Acts 8: 14. James 1: 21. Acts 10: 43. 1 Tim. 1: 15. Appropriation is referred to Job 19: 25. Is. 45: 24. John 20: 28. Gal. 2: 20. foll. It belongs, therefore, to confidence, to seek Christ, Is. 55: 6. Am. 5: 4.—earnestly to seek, Ps. 42: 2. 3. To receive Him with his righteousness, Rom. 9: 30.—to be embraced with the fullest assent, 1 Tim. 1: 15.; his merits are to be applied, Gal. 3: 26. Phil. 1: 21. and sweetly to rest in him, Rom. 4: 21. Heb. 10: 22. This apprehension belongs to the will and is practical; it involves the reclining of the whole heart and will upon the merits of the Redeemer; is distinguished by desire for and access to Christ, and the application and confident appropriation of his merits, and this is truly confidence.

BAIER. This is the faith which is said to apprehend Christ or his merits, particularly as it is assent with confidence, or confidence joined with assent; consisting of these acts alone, and is designated by either indifferently—the other always being implied. Whence it appears, how faith exists in different faculties: in the understanding and will, as if something compounded and united in divers acts determined to the same object, and preserving a certain order amongst each other and towards that one and same object.

HOLLAZ. Faith is in the intellect so far as it embraces knowledge or assent; in the will in regard to confidence.

QUENSTEDT, (IV. 282.) These three parts of faith are expressed in John 14: 10. 11. 12., where verse 10 speaks of knowledge, v. 11 of assent, v. 12 of confidence. The three constituents of faith are conveyed in the phrases, believing in God, (*credere deum*), believing God, (*c. deo*), trusting in God, (*c. in deum*). To believe in God is to believe that God is. To believe God is to regard as true what he has spoken. To trust in God is by believing to love, by believing to be united to him, by believing to adhere to him, and to be incorporated with his members. Heretics can have the first, the second the orthodox alone, the third the regenerate, and therefore the last always includes the first but not the contrary: the first two pertain to the intellect, the third to the will; the first and second respect the entire word of God, the third the promise of grace and the merits of Christ."—(Quenstedt, *ibid.*)

This is a long extract but an imperfect specimen of the work. It will serve to show its spirit, and the manner in which the discussions are conducted. We have furnished but a part of the proofs for the text given above. They will suffice as specimens and serve to make known the author's plan. The numerals in the text refer to illustrations similar in style to the specimens which we have given above. Every position taken is amply sustained by his authorities, and clearly and forcibly set forth, and the word of God is abundantly referred to in proof of what is alleged.

We cannot do better in our attempt to make known the precise character of the work, the circumstances under which it has originated, and the objects to be accomplished, as well as its relation to other productions somewhat similar in character and better known to our public, than by transferring to our pages a notice of it presented in Harless' *Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*, vol. 9. (1845) page 160, & fol.: "The tendency of modern theology is remarkably similar to that of the Reformation: then it was emancipation from scholasticism and return to the ancient ecclesiastical teachers, and finally to the sacred writings, and from this point Theology renovated in all its extent the church; now the tendency of theology is decidedly to the period of the Reformation, the palmy days of our church, and aims from thence to invigorate itself and to construct *de novo* a mighty edifice. To this tendency must we ascribe the republication of the writings of the Reformers, the Symbolical books of the Evangelical church, and many other admirable works of an earlier period, and these being made more generally accessible. The older systematic treatises on theology could not remain long unnoticed, and, accordingly, so early as 1821, the deceased AUGUSTI brought out the first system of dogmatik of the Lutheran church, the *Loci Theologici* of Melancthon, (1521), as in its third centennial jubilee, for the promotion of the study of the older theology. But this return to the earlier period gave rise to other affiliated literary productions, viz. such as aimed to give the old Lutheran doctrines in a systematic form; as instances, we may mention the *Hutterus Redivivus* of Hase, and the work of Schmid, now before us. These two authors pursue different courses. The celebrated author of *Hutterus Redivivus* designs to revive the memory of the older views—to reproduce them as an offset to the rationalism and supernaturalism of the present day, and to show that they have power and dignity enough to occupy a very respectable position, and for this purpose he compares the old and the new, and displays what can be said in favor of the old. The old theology in Hase occupies comparatively a small space, and covers merely the essential points, and those particularly which admit of comparison with the modern theology; and as a consequence Hase makes his own views prominent, averring unhesitatingly that he occupies the stand-point, which the ancient Hutter, without detriment to orthodoxy, would occupy in the nineteenth century. Dr. Schmid's aim is very different. He keeps aloof from all comparison of the prevailing views, and aims to present objectively the old Lutheran dogmatik in

its totality. His task is a purely historic one, and his aim to present a true account, both as to form and substance, of the theology of the Lutheran church, in the period of primitive Lutheran orthodoxy. In the accomplishment of this, the author seeks in brief, clear and distinct paragraphs, to display the doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran church as they were systematically unfolded by the old divines, and then establishes what he affirms, by extracts from them, that his readers may put themselves in possession of as perfect as possible a representation of the system of that period, both as to form and substance. The proof passages are selected with great industry and skill, and they are so happily adjusted that there is scarcely any repetition, but every additional citation completes and amplifies the preceding; affords new proof of the point, or opens a more comprehensive, universal and complete view of it; moreover, objections and deviations of opponents, or of other churches, are not passed by in the authorities, and hence it happens that entirely new topics are introduced — as page 68, the relation of the earlier to the later symbols; on the meaning of the word symbolism; on the relation of the symbolical books to the Scriptures; on the necessity of symbolical books, and on the oath in regard to them; p. 142, on the difference between the christian doctrine in regard to providence and that which prevailed before it; p. 144 and 145, on the reference of providence to the commencement, the progress and the end of human life; p. 402, ff., on the name, import and number of the sacraments," &c. Passing over some points similar to what has already been introduced, the reviewer remarks, in the close of his article: "The entire exhibition is exceedingly convenient for inspection, and furnishes, not only by the division and arrangement, a perfect insight into the theology of the old Lutheran church, but gives us a lively picture of the depth and fulness of the old Lutheran divines, in the judicious selections which have been made from their writings.

These divines have, in a special degree, this peculiarity, that faith, knowledge, and life appear in the most beautiful harmony; they believe what they know, and they seek to know and master what they believe, and appear mainly to know and believe what is essential to the christian life and of real value, and it is this which imparts to their writings a singular freshness and power."

The question may be asked, is this theology of any importance to the Lutheran church in America? To this question, which has not unfrequently been put, and particularly since

these views have again been brought before the church, answers have been furnished with great readiness, and we may venture to say with an emphasis, which was not justified by either a very thorough knowledge of the subject or even a decent acquaintance with it. It is affirmed by young divines and by old, some of whom, we fear, cannot read the divines whom they condemn in the language which they employ to convey their ideas, that all this divinity is obsolete—it belongs to a dark age and to half illuminated men—that it is deserving of no respect and reflects no special credit on its authors. Its peculiarities are regarded as beneath criticism, and based upon views which can find no tolerance, not a particle, in the deductions of reason and an enlightened exegesis of the word of God.

Others, with a better appreciation of the gigantic intellect employed in these researches, according to our earlier divines, eminent abilities and extraordinary devotion to the interests of theology and theological science, nevertheless maintain that such advances have been made in every department of theology, since the days of Luther, Melancthon, and their immediate successors, that we may safely discard their instructions, those we mean that were peculiar to them, and feel confident, too, that if they could now reappear amongst men, or if they had their existence granted to them in the present era of light, they would be the first to dash their own system in pieces, and foremost in placing themselves in the ranks of modern orthodoxy. But even admitting that these views are correct, it by no means follows that we should be indifferent either to the writings of the Reformers, the Symbolical books, or the system of the earlier divines. They belong to the history of the church which we call our own; they have, independently of intrinsic value, a high historic importance. No man, who has a tolerable acquaintance with them, can say that they do not contain, on all vital points of christianity the noblest instruction; in all christian experience the amplest developments, and in all points of christian ethics the purest lessons.

Our verdict is unequivocally in behalf of the study, the thorough study of this theology. We would have it thrown over our church with a liberal hand; we would have all our ministers acquainted with the Symbolical books; we would have them all versed in the distinctive theology of the church. We would have introduced into our theological schools the study of the symbols, and didactic and polemic theology so administered as to bring before the view pure, unadulterated

Lutheranism. The gain to our ministry and to our church would be immense, if this course were adopted. As things are, we have no standard, no guide. Every one is left to fix his own views; and whilst we presume there is general agreement in our church on the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, our ministers display, in the opinions they entertain, sometimes a decided Calvinistic influence, sometimes an extreme Arminian, sometimes a Pelagian. There is, we think, very little of the ancient theology, about which we need entertain any doubt; the mass of it has never been, and we believe never will be, surpassed. Some points may be found untenable—some may need modification—the defence of the whole may be placed, in some respects, upon a surer basis—but, take it all in all, we do not expect it ever to become obsolete. It is not designed that the inference should be made that the writer agrees in his views with these theologians; he does not mean to endorse every thing that they have written; he does not intend to intimate that wisdom has died with them; he does not think of disparaging the labors of later theologians; he does not avow it as his belief, that the period of progress terminated with the labors of these men; he does not believe that future advances are not to be made in the knowledge of God and divine things; but grateful for what has been done by great men in a great age,—admiring the power of intellect, the strength of logic, and the skill in holy writ displayed by these Lutheran Fathers, believing that they were more than ordinary men, and deeply imbued with the spirit of the great Author of Christianity—he simply proposes that they shall be honored for what they have done, that their cause may be heard, that they may be decorously treated by their sons in this western hemisphere, and that they may be made subservient to our instruction in all truth and righteousness, so far as they evince themselves capable of becoming so. Indeed, if we would refute their doctrines, we ought at least know what they were, and fully to comprehend them; and if we would do it effectually we should go back to the fundamental principles on which their system is based, and destroying the foundation secure an easy victory over all that has been made to rest upon it. Should this work of demolition be undertaken by us, we shall discern that the very weapons which we will employ may be gathered from their own writings, and enjoy the satisfaction of knowing how they would meet our polemics by looking at what was done by them, when their contemporaries met them with the same instruments. It is, indeed, a singular fact, very singular, we think, that all this stolidity,

as it is regarded so often, and so easily refuted, should, nevertheless, as has been intimated already, be revived so extensively in our day, revived after the intellect of man has exhausted itself in devising systems of every description, has employed itself in producing opinions of every shade and hue—it is strange that it should now seek repose and satisfaction in these exploded dogmas, and embrace them, not only as a rich treasure, but as the only satisfactory account of the contents of the Book of God. This in itself ought to temper our bitterness of condemnation, soothe the anger with which we are ready to assail them, and induce us to believe that the cause of the opponents of the older orthodoxy is not so clearly established as to preclude the necessity of any further investigation.

Schmid's work has been translated in the United States, but has not been put to press or published. It would be rendering a good service to our church to bring it out. It may be doubtful whether the patronage would justify the expense, but we think that the increasing desire to become acquainted with the doctrines of the church, and the demand for the Symbolical books are symptomatic of a return to better feelings than have prevailed in regard to the church, and that the time has passed away in which we are to assume every phase which may be presented to us, to glory that we are like every body, and, consequently, are nothing in ourselves, living only by the breath of others. These are signs of the times—they mean that the things which have been, can be no more; that the church is returning to the sobriety of her better days, and that theology, systematic and biblical, may expect to receive attention such as it deserves. Let, then, the holders of this book, in its translated form, as soon as they can, without incurring loss, bring it out; and although their labors may be followed by no pecuniary profit, they will do good; they will aid in making known the patristic theology of our church and prepare the way for an intelligent determination of the extent to which we can subscribe to the orthodoxy of other days.

K.

ARTICLE IX.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AS A MEANS OF DISCIPLINE
IN SCHOOLS.*

By Benjamin Kurtz, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

On the subject of discipline in schools, we assume as an axiom, the principle, that *obedience and order are indispensable to successful instruction*. Judicious rules of government must be proposed, and these rules *must* be maintained and enforced. The prosperity of the school and the good of each individual pupil, demand it. But *how* and *by what means*, is this great desideratum to be secured?

We are by no means prepared to admit that corporal punishment may safely be entirely dispensed with; especially not in the present condition of our schools. We cannot admit that it is a "relic of barbarism;" "inconsistent with the principles upon which our High School is established;" that "boys so disciplined" can exercise only "the slave's vices;" that "their hands will be upon every man's property and their tongue will be a fountain of lies;" that "degraded in youth and wicked in manhood, they will startle society with their crimes." The lessons of universal experience as exhibited throughout the civilized world, scatter this gloomy

* About a year ago the Board of Commissioners of the Public Schools in Baltimore, (twenty in number, selected by the City Council, in the ratio of one from each of the twenty wards of the city,) passed a Resolution, abolishing the use of the rod in the male High School of the city and substituting "moral suasion," and, as ulterior and final measures, "suspension and expulsion." After a trial of some eight months, we have been informed, it was the opinion of several of the Commissioners that this change in the discipline had not operated favorably, and a resolution was accordingly offered to rescind the former resolution and restore to the teachers the right of corporal punishment. The subject, as we learn, was argued with unusual freedom and perseverance at several meetings of the Board, and it was at length determined, by a considerable majority, to return to the original mode of discipline. The minority entered upon the records of the Board a well written "Protest" against the measure, and the writer of the subjoined article was appointed on the part of the majority, to prepare a "Rejoinder," which was subsequently in like manner recorded in the archives. This statement will explain to the reader several of the allusions contained in the article. The article comprehends the substance of a speech delivered by the author before the Board, while the question was in process of discussion, and is committed to the press in compliance with the wishes of the majority who heard it read, and of many others who were anxious for an opportunity to read it. It is but fair to add, that several pages of the original document have been stricken out by the author, as void of *general* interest, having exclusively a *local* application.—ED.

picture in shreds to the winds; nay, the unexceptionable deportment and habitual reverence for law and order, characteristic of the objectors themselves, who have generally been educated in schools from which corporal punishment was not banished, constitute the most triumphant refutation of these groundless prognostics, and prove that they must be regarded as mere declamation, or the unrestrained figment of a deluded imagination.

We take pleasure in conceding to reason or "moral suasion," to the fullest extent, all the influence that its warmest advocates can justly claim. We are convinced that governing by *kindness* is decidedly "a more excellent way." Love is transcendently a beautiful and powerful element in human character; it is that which most assimilates us to the Deity, the fountain of all moral and intellectual perfection; it is "the magician's wand, in its potent control over the rebellious and angry passions of the soul." But, that regularity, order, and submission to approved rules can be secured by exclusively moral influences, and in the absence of even authority to have recourse to coercive measures, however wisely such measures may be employed, is a position to which we cannot assent. We indeed believe that the rod should, in general, be used sparingly, impartially, with great discretion, and only when all other proper influences have been exhausted, never while the teacher is under the influence of passion; never capriciously, cruelly, or excessively; rarely or never in the presence of the assembled school, but privately, always with manifest reluctance, a just regard to the dispositions of the offender and the magnitude of the offense, and an adequate explanation of the necessity of the measure, on the principle, that the general interests of the school and the advancement of the *many* must not be sacrificed to the waywardness of *an individual*. Under these and other just limitations, we should suppose, that all parents who truly love their offspring would sanction the measure in question, and feel greatly indebted to the teachers for thus aiding them in training their sons for future usefulness and respectability.

Teachers who habitually violate such restrictions in administering discipline, thereby prove that they are deficient in one of the essential qualifications for their high vocation, should not be retained at the head of any school even for a day.

Having thus defined our position, we proceed to state some of the arguments by which it is sustained:—

I. The highest authority to which we can appeal, and from which, with christian men, there ought to be no dissent,

is that of Divine Inspiration ; — and we are happy to remark, that on this subject we are supplied with the most unambiguous instruction. "He that spareth his rod," says the wisest of men, "hateth his own son ; but he that loveth him, chastiseth him betimes."¹ "Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child, but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him."² "Withhold not correction from a child, for if thou beatest him with a rod, he shall not die."³ "The rod and reproof give wisdom, but a child left to himself, bringeth his mother to shame."⁴ These quotations are too plain to require comment, and as there can be no discrepancy between "the arguments urged from the old dispensation, and the teachings of the Gospel of love," as has been maintained by some, we find that the New Testament inculcates the same principle. Nay, the very "chiefest of the apostles" asks with astonishment: "What son is he whom the father chasteneth not?" and then declares, that so utterly incompatible with parental duty and affection is the withholding of merited corporal chastisement, that the father who withholds it, treats his offspring "as bastards and not as sons."⁵

In accordance with this sentiment is also the declaration of the same distinguished personage, that "the heir differeth not from a servant."⁶ But if the son during his minority, differ nothing from the servant, then it is plain that it was the Apostle's doctrine, that corporal punishment should be inflicted on the one as on the other, when demanded, under the administration of pedagogic no less than domestic government.

II. *Our next argument we derive from the divine moral government of the world.* Remonstrance and expostulation, or in other words, "moral suasion," is invariably first employed in the administration of God's moral government. And to render this more efficient, we find every human mind endued with an original inherent moral faculty, denominated *conscience*, which approves or accuses according to the character of our actions.

But if this means prove ineffectual, corporal chastisement is uniformly resorted to, as well in reference to nations and communities, as to individuals. In proof of this fact we refer to the annals of the Ante-diluvian world, the Jewish people, and all the nations of Europe, as well as to each man's individual history. Indeed, we are physiologically so constituted, that we cannot habitually violate the laws of nature, without in-

¹ Proverbs 13: 24. ² Ibid. 22: 15. ³ Ibid. 23: 13. ⁴ Ibid. 29: 15.
Vide also Prov. 10: 13, and 29: 17. ⁵ Heb. 12: 7—8. ⁶ Gal. 4: 1.

curing corporal punishment, and this punishment is always proportioned with unerring precision to the degree of moral turpitude attaching to our infractions of those laws. As illustrations, witness the sad spectacle presented in the personal experience of the poor inebriate; the gay libertine; the thoughtless spendthrift; the heartless miser; &c. Thus we perceive that the practical procedure of the Governor of the Universe, strictly corresponds with and corroborates his own wise, abstract teachings. Would, that our own theory and practice, were always in like manner in harmonious accordance with each other!

III. Our third argument is derived from the example of *all well-regulated human governments*, both public and private, or civil and domestic. In both cases moral influences are first employed, but if they fail to preserve order and secure obedience, peremptory authority, coercion, and corporal punishment, are invariably resorted to. Thus, the principle for which we contend, is universally recognized and sanctioned, whether we look to God or man, whether we raise our eyes to the skies or cast them abroad upon the earth.

IV. But, after all, "experience is the best teacher;" abstract argument is of little value if in conflict with stubborn facts; hence it is truly said, that "an ounce of sober experience is worth a pound of speculative theory." Our fourth consideration is accordingly taken from the *universal experience of all ages and countries*, and especially of Prussia and other countries in Germany, and of Scotland, in all of which pedagogics have been most profoundly studied, reached their highest degree of perfection, and where education and scholarship have achieved their most glorious triumphs, gathered their greenest laurels, and attained the most elevated pinnacle of human admiration and world-renown. In all these countries it has been ascertained, after the most mature investigation and the fullest experience, that while every desirable purpose in the government of a school should be *aimed at* by intellectual and moral means, yet it is unwise and in many cases must prove disastrous, to strip teachers of authority and deprive them of the right to coerce obedience when other means are found inadequate. Ought we not to profit by the lessons taught us by older and more experienced countries, in ancient as well as in modern times? If human nature were less corrupt at present than formerly—in this hemisphere than in the eastern—in Baltimore than in other towns—in our cities than in country villages, we might find a pretext for making an experiment, which, with scarce an isolated exception, has re-

sulted in disappointment, and suffused the cheeks of its precipitous advocates with the blush of mortification and shame. So long as human nature remains what it has uniformly been ever since the primeval apostasy, and the allurements to moral delinquency retain their inherent force and accustomed charms, instances of aberration will transpire which may not be restrained by reason and exhortation, and must be brought under the absolute prohibitory influence of physical power. This is unquestionably due to the more ductile class of youths, who with proper management may be governed without the rod, no less than to the intractable and rebellious. For it is a flagrant injustice to the well-disposed to subject the former to constantly recurring temptations, and to impede their progress in study for the sake of exercising undue indulgence and a mistaken leniency towards the latter.

It was observed by Locke, and has since been frequently remarked by others, that our instructors in dancing, drawing, or fencing, seldom inflict personal correction; and why, then, say they, should the teachers of Greek and Latin? To this it is sufficient to reply that the acquisition of these so-called accomplishments is rather an amusement than a study, requiring neither very laborious nor very irksome application; and that submission to the teacher is enforced, when necessary, not by a rod in his own hand, but by the authority of the parent at home and that of the master at school.

V. A fifth consideration in favor of our position may be found in *the impatience under restraint and actual disobedience characteristic of the rising generation in our country*. In a recent conversation with a distinguished divine, he several times employed the phrase "the signs of the times;" on being asked what he meant, he ranked foremost in these "*signs*" the disobedience and recklessness of boys and girls; adding, "I am surprised that so striking a *sign* should escape the notice of any one." We once travelled with a remarkably accomplished old English lady—a near relation of the learned and pious Bishop Wilson, of Calcutta—who had made "the tour of the States," and written very sensibly respecting our country. We asked her what had struck her most forcibly in her travels; to which she promptly replied, "the waywardness and turbulence of your children, and the refractory spirit of your half-grown and full-grown sons and daughters. Oh, sir! I can't tell you how amazed I am in beholding such distressing scenes of premature independence and filial disobedience." "You can hardly be said," she continued, "to have children; they are mostly 'free and independent' *young gentlemen* and

ladies before they have fully begun to be children." "And," she added, "the patient tameness with which parents submit to all this is no less remarkable than the rebellion of their offspring." While we were conscious that this picture was too highly colored, we could not but admit that there was too much truth in it. You may make the tour of Germany without witnessing a single street-fight between boys; the beautiful flower-garden; the clustering grape-vine and bending fruit-tree; the delightful umbrageous "allée," shading the public highway for continuous miles; the richly-ornamented public promenade, vocal with the song of the homely but enrapturing philomel, and abounding with fruit, flowers, and fountains, need not be constantly guarded in order to protect them from the ravages of lawless boys. There no defaced and broken milestones, bespattered handboards, mutilated works of art, &c. mark the Vandal devastations of self-willed juveniles. And there, let it be remembered, no sickly sentimentalism in reference to coercive discipline has found foothold; no hasty and unwise abandonment of the rod from pedagogic and domestic government has met with countenance. How different the aspect of things in our country! We would almost as soon encounter a Mexican banditti as a knot of American "rowdy-boys" in any of our larger cities. We take pleasure in conceding to our excellent system of Sunday schools and other moral agencies of the church all the salutary influence that can be claimed for them. But for these instrumentalities the evil we complain of would doubtless be still more enormous.

To what must we ascribe this alarming spirit of lawlessness? Various causes may be assigned, but we hold that one of the most pregnant is the want of faithful family government, and the opposition, too prevalent, to every thing like effective discipline in school. Not content with casting away the authoritative power which God has vested in them, parents have also refused to allow it to be exercised by the preceptors and governors of their offspring in school. The clear and decided teaching of the wisest of men—a man inspired of God, as well as enlightened by the most extensive experience—passes for nothing with them. Infected with the delusive spirit of pseudo-reform, swayed by a false affection, a misguided leniency, and a blighting partiality, they are contributing all they can to render their sons and daughters wretched, to treasure up grief for themselves, and inflict through the fruit of their own bodies a withering curse upon society. And is this the time, and this the country to hasten the downward

progress of such radicalism by the complete prostration of the teacher's authority in our public schools?

But it is proposed to substitute suspension and expulsion, should moral means prove ineffectual, as even more deterring than corporal punishment itself. This remedy, however, is more to be dreaded, if possible, than the disease itself. It is better to try to instruct boys, even while in a state of insubordination, than to exclude them wholly from the benefits of education, and give them over to utter ignorance and recklessness. The moral malady of indolence and disorder is first invited by lax and ineffectual discipline, and then, instead of appropriate efforts to eradicate it, the unfortunate victims are cut off, disgraced, and consigned to almost certain destruction! This is adding degradation and ruin to gross neglect and unpardonable innovation! What is the consequence? Why, a large proportion of boys are annually discharged from our higher schools and colleges before they have any thing like an advantageous education, mainly on account of the want of proper habits of study and subordination, which our modern system of "moral suasion" is inadequate to establish. Hundreds of boys, of talented boys, who might have become scholars and gentlemen, the pride of their parents, an honor to their race, and benefactors to society, have been branded with ignominy by expulsion from school—an expulsion courted and superinduced by the repudiation of the only effectual means to restrain them, and this at the very juncture when they most needed such restraining influence! And now, just sufficiently educated to increase their capacity for evil-doing, they are roving about in the world with an indelible stigma fastened upon them, which strangles every noble aspiration, paralyzes every dawning effort to reform, and drives them to increased desperation. That such unfortunates should become a nuisance to society, vagabonds and fugitives on the face of the earth, bringing down the gray hairs of their parents with sorrow to the grave, and finally winding up the dark drama of their criminal career in prison, or on the scaffold, is just what, in the common course of events, we are bound to expect.

In view of these facts, we cannot but deprecate that dangerous radicalism, which, under the guise of reform, is aiming to destroy all coercive power in families and schools, no less than in communities.

It is a remarkable and pregnant fact, that we have never met with an old and experienced teacher, of established reputation in his profession, who would venture to assert without

qualification, that a high and uniform degree of discipline could be secured by *moral means* alone. The rod, when not wrested from the preceptor, even though very rarely used, nevertheless exerts an influence which tends greatly to promote good order. The unanimous testimony of the best and ablest teachers in every country and age, especially in those countries where the most successful school systems have been adopted, is all on the side we are advocating; if there be any dissenting voices they are so few and far between as to remain unheard and lost amid the loud and concurrent tones of the great bulk of the enlightened world.

Quinctilian, the great rhetorician, is the only ancient author of celebrity who is against us. But even his judgment seems to have been swayed more by the indecent and barbarous mode in which corporal punishment was inflicted in his day, than by a conviction of its abstract impropriety; and, by his own confession, the general practice of ancient times was always in favor of our views. We are happy to have it in our power to add, that the example of the best of our modern schools lies in the same direction. If boys obstinately refuse to be governed by reason, they *must* be controlled by authority; if kindness have not the desired effect, the virtue of the birch must be tested. "If," says the distinguished and honorable Horace Mann, "if the teacher's mind cannot overmaster the pupil's mind in its present condition; and if the teacher's heart be not of such superior moral power as to overcome and assimilate to itself the heart of the pupil, there is one resource left: the teacher's physical power is superior to the pupil's physical power, (for the teacher has a legal right to summon all necessary assistance to his aid,) and with this superiority he *must* begin the work of reform. Order *must* be maintained; this is the primal law. The superiority of the *heart*—the superiority of the *head*—the superiority of the *arm*; this is the order of means to secure observance of the law."¹

The intimation in the "Protest" that such a course may "transform the high spirit of an American boy into a confirmed habit of slavish obedience," we regard as a mere rhetorical flourish to round a fine sentence. While there is much in the Protest which we admire, and most of the remarks in favor of moral influences have our entire approbation, we are free to confess that, with the sentiment just adverted to, which has the appearance of a lure thrown out to captivate the unthinking, we can have no sympathy. Why, even *Busby*

¹ "Common School Journal;" Boston, June 1, 1846, p. 161.

himself, hardly more celebrated for his *talents* than for his *severity*, in the conduct of his school, was not more revered than *beloved* by those who felt the good effects of his authoritative and rigid discipline as well as of his instruction.

Mr. J. Orville Taylor, than whom few men in our country have more profoundly studied, or written more wisely on this subject, says: "*I know that with some scholars you must use force; but in the first place try the influence of persuasion and reason.*" Again: "*True it is, that the teacher must have authority; he is the governor of his little republic; and must be obeyed.*" Once more: "*Punishments will sometimes be found necessary. But severe punishments should be used with great care.*"¹ On the subject of inflicting punishment *privately*, we entirely coincide with Mr. Taylor when he remarks: "*Punishments should seldom, if ever, be inflicted before the school. The fear of being laughed at, or called a fellow of 'no spunk,' will prevent the criminal from yielding as soon as he would otherwise do, if his pride was not touched by the presence of his associates. When the criminal is arraigned before the school, he will be less inclined to confess his fault and ask the forgiveness of the teacher.*" . . . "The teacher should take the offenders aside, where they may be unseen and unheard, and then show them the nature of the offense, and its consequences upon the school and its authors. If he find punishment necessary he should administer it with calmness and affection, convincing his pupils that he is pained because he loves them."²

"Crimes," continues Mr. Taylor, "which are common to many of the scholars, should be made known and corrected before the school—such as the use of profane language, lying, quarreling, and disrespect. These crimes the teacher should publicly reprimand."³

Even Mr. Jacob Abbott, late principal of the Mt. Vernon Female School, Boston, a gentleman of most extensive experience, who has written an excellent book of some hundreds of pages for the express purpose of discouraging the use of the rod, and advocating "moral suasion," admits that, although moral influences are the chief foundation, &c. yet that his "system is a system of authority—supreme and unlimited authority: a point essential in all plans for the supervision of the young. But it is authority secured and maintained, *as far as possible*, by moral means."⁴ A philosopher once urged the

¹ "The District School;" pp. 98-99.

² Ibid. pp. 100-101.

³ Essay on Education, vol. I, p. 64.

⁴ Vide "The Teacher," p. 3.

doctrine we are combating, upon Coleridge, alledging that it was unfair and hurtful to restrain or coerce the youthful disposition. "I showed him my garden," says Coleridge, "and told him it was my botanical garden." "How so?" replied the pseudo-philosopher, "it is overgrown with weeds!" "Oh," rejoined Coleridge, "the weeds you see had an early start, and I thought it injurious to *force* the soil towards roses and strawberries."

The testimony of Dr. Barrow, of London, author of the Bampton Lecture for 1799, deserves to be quoted.¹ "The decisive argument, however, for governing a child by authority, is the *impossibility of governing him by any other means.*" "To attempt to manage him by reason, as some modern theorists have recommended, is *beginning where we ought to finish.* Reason is the last of our faculties which attains to its maturity; or rather it is the inaturity of all our faculties together; it is the *end* at which we aim in education, not the means by which we pursue it." "We entirely concur with Rousseau in this respect, that we may with as much propriety require our sons to be six feet high as to exercise judgment in a degree beyond its developement. In other words, we must not expect to gather the fruits of autumn while we are contemplating the blossoms and beauties of spring."

Again, says Dr. Barrow, "Of all good discipline at school, I have ever seen reason to believe that this, to wit, the rod, must continue to be what it has hitherto been, the beginning and the end, the basis and the completion."² "It is indeed easy," he continues, "to declaim on the tyranny and cruelty of the too frequent use of the rod; to enumerate instances of its misapplication and excess; to suppose extreme cases, in order to subject them to censure and reproach. How difficult soever it may be to *prove*, it is still easy to assert, that the constant fear of punishment is a principle of action adapted only to the slave, and the frequent infliction of its treatment fit only for beasts of burden. Nor can willing auditors of such declamation be wanting in an age where the exertion of parental authority is continually relinquished for the indulgence of parental affection, and the permanent advantage of our children daily sacrificed to their immediate gratification." "Upon the pretext, accordingly, of excluding corporal punishment, many schools have risen among us (in England) with the rapidity of exhalations; but for the want of the utility which such punishment would have

¹ Essay on Education, vol. I, p. 64.

² Ibid. vol. II, p. 141.

secured, have with little less rapidity disappeared. . . . "The motives which affection and liberality can supply, will not longer be able to counteract the love of ease or the love of play. The pain and shame of correction alone will be found permanently efficacious. Who indeed would submit to the drudgery of repetition and composition, but from the apprehension of some greater evil, as the consequence of idleness or disobedience! A pupil will sometimes not only neglect his task, but refuse to perform it; and even declare his contempt of every penalty short of corporal chastisement. It will often happen that the assistant teachers, and sometimes that the master himself, will be purposely insulted. There will be occasion to repress swearing or obscenity, deliberate falsehood, and even fraud or theft. For these offences personal chastisement will be found indispensibly necessary. The rod *must* be employed to correct habits which otherwise lead to a life of infamy and terminate in a death of shame.¹

We should be inexcusable if, on such a subject as this, we omitted to refer to the testimony of the late "Head Master of Rugby School," that master-intellect, profound scholar, and prince of teachers, the late *Thomas Arnold, D. D.* His able biographer, *Stanley*, informs us that Arnold 'retained flogging' but it was confined to moral offenses, such as "lying, drinking, and habitual idleness, while his aversion to inflicting it, rendered it still less frequent in practice than it would have been according to the rule he had laid down for it." But in answer to the argument used in a liberal journal, that it was, even for these offenses and for this age, degrading, he replied with characteristic emphasis:—

"I know well of what feeling this is the expression; it originates in that proud notion of personal independence, which is neither reasonable nor christian — but essentially barbarian. It visited Europe with all the curses of the age of chivalry, and is threatening us now with those of Jacobinism. . . . At an age when it is almost impossible to find a true manly sense of the degradation of guilt or of faults, where is the wisdom of encouraging a fantastic sense of the degradation of personal correction? What can be more false or more averse to the simplicity, sobriety and humbleness of mind which are the best ornament of youth, and the best promise of a noble manhood?"²

¹ Essay on Education, Vol. II. pp. 142—145.

² Jour. Education, Vol. IX. pp. 231, 234.

If, however, the use of the rod still be deemed objectionable by some, let it be remembered, that no species of discipline has yet been devised against which plausible objections may not be adduced. It is one of the imperfections of human things, that to almost every good is annexed an inseparable evil. One of the monarchs of antiquity is said to have promised a magnificent reward to him, that should invent an untried pleasure; and he, who should discover an efficacious means of enforcing juvenile diligence and obedience without any necessity for a resort to the rod, would deserve to be ranked amongst the benefactors of mankind, and receive the thanks of all future ages.

The punishment of *expulsion* for obstinate misconduct, which the minority advocate, as a final substitute for personal chastisement, we have already adverted to. We shall only add, that we deem it much more severe, and far more degrading than that for which it is intended to be a substitute. The lad thus expelled and disgraced, bears the stigma through life, and is often rendered desperate so as to have no encouragement or spirit left even to attempt a reformation. If corporal punishment be objectionable, much more is this withering extremity, and hence it should scarcely ever be resorted to; certainly not until the last flickering ray of hope to reclaim the culprit shall have been extinguished, and the interests of the school imperiously demand it. The legality of this crushing species of punishment is even beginning to be questioned, and by a recent decision in one of the courts of Massachusetts, it was declared to be inadmissible, since boys who may be deemed fit subjects of expulsion are the very ones who most need to be kept under the restraining and reforming influences of good schools. To what degree of severity personal correction may be carried, it is of little importance to inquire, because impossible to determine with precision. "Punishment," says Barrow, "must be regulated, not so much by any general rule, as by character and occasions." Locke mentions a mother with applause, who eight times repeated the chastisement of whipping before the stubbornness of her child was overcome. "*Had she stopped,*" says he, "*at the seventh correction, her daughter had been ruined.*" The parent must be content to resign his son to the discipline of a school of reputation, and to the discretion and humanity of an approved master; and the master must always bear in mind, that, however atrocious may be the offenses brought before him for animadversion, his authority is not only delegated, but circumscribed within very narrow limits; that though he is necessa-

rily allowed the power of punishment, it is always another man's child, whom he is to punish; that he is permitted to exert, not greater, but less severity, than the parent might reasonably exert in his place; and that no cause or provocation whatsoever, can justify any such chastisement as may permanently injure the features, the limbs, or the health of the boys entrusted to his care.

ARTICLE X.

HYMNS FROM THE GERMAN OF LUTHER ACCORDING TO THE ORIGINAL METRES.

By William M. Reynolds.

No. 1. A version of "*Nu freud euch, lieben Christen gmein.*" *

1. Rejoice ye ransom'd of the Lord,
Now banish all your sadness,
Tune all your hearts with one accord,
And sing aloud for gladness:
Tell what the Lord for us hath wrought,
At what a price our souls he bought,
And all his wondrous goodness.
2. A thrall of Satan once I lay,
Beneath death's gloomy power,
Sin rack'd my soul by night and day,
And deeper, deeper ev'ry hour,
From that which gave me birth, I fell;
No peace within my breast might dwell,
Sin reign'd in all my nature.
3. Good works with me could naught avail,
By them I must have perish'd;
To goodness dead, I dar'd assail
His law who me had cherish'd!
My anguish drove me to despair,
Whilst death frown'd on me ev'rywhere,
And hell yawn'd just before me.
4. Then touch'd my wretchedness the heart
Of Him who reigns in heaven,
He deign'd his mercy to impart,
And show my sins forgiven—
My father's heart yearn'd over me
What greater love than this could be
Which gave his richest treasure?

* In making these translations I have before me the admirable work of Dr. K. E. F. Wackernagel, "*Das Deutsche Kirchenlied von Martin Luther bis auf Nicholas Herman und Ambrosius Blaurer. Stuttgart, Liesching, 1841.*" Wackernagel has every where been careful to restore the text of the original edition.

5. "Go my beloved Son," said He,
Thou who my glory wearest,
Now let the world my mercy see
Whilst thou salvation bearest;
Now burst their bonds and free from sin,
Destroy the reign of death, and win
Eternal life for sinners."
6. The Son obey'd the Father's voice,
He own'd his virgin mother,
Let all the world aloud rejoice,
He hath become my brother;
Yea, he my humble form assumes,
And Satan to perdition dooms,
And thus his kingdom cometh.
7. To me he said: "Cleave unto me,
Thou shalt not be rejected,
I gave myself to death for thee;
Thy ransom is effected;
For I am thine and thou art mine
And, though ten thousand foes combine,
Thou shalt be mine forever.
8. The foe indeed will shed my blood,
And on the cross will slay me,
But this I suffer for thy good—
Let faith on this still stay thee—
My life the pow'r of death shall break,
Mine innocence thy guilt shall take,
And thus shalt thou be blesséd.
9. Unto my father now I go,
From earth ascend to heaven,
But there my love I still will show,
My Spirit shall be given;
He shall, 'mid ev'ry grief, console,
And into thy benighted soul
Shall pour the light of heaven.
10. What I have done and taught below
That do and teach thou ever,
That God's own kingdom here may grow
Its glory failing never.
But of the words of men beware,
Lest they should prove a fatal snare,
And rob thee of thy treasure." AMEN.

No. 2. A version of "*Ah Got von Himel, sieh darcin.*"
(The 12th Psalm.)

1. O God! look down from heav'n, we pray,
Thy tenderness awaken!
Thy saints, so few, fast fade away—
Hast thou thy poor forsaken?
Thy word no more is taught aright,
And faith from earth hath vanish'd quite—
O Lord, our God, revive us!

2. They teach but falsehood and deceit
By their own heart invented,
And in their varying creeds we meet
Few truths thy word presented—
One chooses this, another that,
Contending for they know not what,
Tho' specious their appearance.
3. From teachers of false doctrine, Lord,
Thy church we pray deliver;
They undertake to rule thy word,
As wiser than its giver.
Who shall control our tongues, they say,
Who dare prescribe another way,
Who has dominion o'er us?
4. God therefore saith, "I will arise,
My poor they are oppressing;
I see their tears, I hear their cries,
Their wrongs shall have redressing.
My healing word shall now appear,
The proud shall think its truths severe,
But it shall save the humble.
5. As silver sev'n times purified
Is known and priz'd the higher,
The word of God when fully tried
Doth deeper love inspire:
The cross but proves its greater worth,
It shines abroad o'er all the earth,
Enlight'ning all the nations.
6. O God, preserve it pure, we pray,
In this vile generation—
May we still walk its perfect way,
And see thy full salvation.
Here may it make the simple wise,
And there, beyond the glittering skies,
Fill every mouth with gladness.

ARTICLE XI.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Rudolph Garrigue's Catalogue of Books, Periodicals, Maps, Atlases, etc. published in Germany, from July 1st to December 31st, 1848.* New York, 2 Barclay st. (Astor House) April, 1849.

This is a finely printed volume of over three hundred pages 12 mo. Although bearing upon its title-page the impress of *New York*, it was, we suppose, printed in Germany, as it is the usual

Vol. I. No. 1. 19

semi-annual "Booksellers' Catalogue" of that land of books, which we might almost suppose to be the annual reproduction, in a somewhat changed form, to be sure, of the leaves of the forests with which Teutonia was once covered, but which have long since disappeared before the power of civilization of which these books are either the ripest or, as the case may be, the rankest product. Not even the rocking and upheaving earthquake, and outpouring, fiery flood of the volcano of Revolution can there check the flood, the annual inundation of books. And it would be strange if it should; for the constantly accumulating, deepening, and widening intelligence of Germany, of which her literature is both the cause and the effect, is doubtless one of the main influences that have given an impulse to this revolution. The instinct of despotism long since foresaw this, and hence the sleepless vigilance and iron hand with which the censorship of the press was conducted. But all that labor was lost, and worse than lost; for you might as well attempt to bottle up all the lightning of the atmosphere in Leyden jars as to prevent the diffusion of intelligence, free thought, and free speech in the world, or in any part of it where a particle of it exists—the utmost that you can do will be to collect together what may give the awkward operator a shock, whilst enough will still be left in the earth and in the atmosphere either to fertilize and vivify, or to descend in a storm of vengeance upon the head of the guilty offender, and so to purify the moral atmosphere. We do not mean by this to approve of all that is done in German or in any other revolutions, any more than we approve of the Machiavellian and Metternichean policy of kings and despots by which these excesses are provoked. But we do mean to argue against those German and other conservative literati, and theologians especially, who fear that these revolutions are to usher in another age of barbarism, and that science, religion, and literature will expire amid the convulsions that rend society. No; as we have already said, these revolutions are the offspring of increasing intelligence, and it is not far a moment to be feared that the child will lay parricidal hands upon its parent. It is a matter of course that the business of book-making, like all other business, will be temporarily suspended amid the clash of arms and the throes of a revolution; but just as all other business ultimately revives and is stimulated and invigorated by increased liberty, so will this. Oppression is indeed a heavy weight upon all human interests, but nowhere is liberty

more needed than in the movements of mind of one of whose fundamental faculties it is a characteristic attribute.

In fact the catalogue before us already gives evidence that thought is beginning to flow in its wonted channels. Though it shows a falling off of nearly one-third when compared with the corresponding catalogue of last year, it still contains a sufficient array of names and subjects to maintain the long-established literary ascendancy of Germany over all other parts of the world in the quantity at least, if not in the quality of its books. As an illustration of this, we may mention that "The London Catalogue of Books published in Great Britain, with their prices, sizes, and publishers' names, from 1814 to 1846," that is, for thirty-two years, is only an 8vo volume of 542 pages, whilst the German catalogue for this single year of depression, 1849, will be a 12mo volume of at least as many pages, and not less than half the contents. Menzel (as quoted in an interesting article in the *Edinburgh Review* for April, 1849, on "The Vanity and Glory of Literature," p. 152, Am. edition) says: "In Germany alone, according to a moderate calculation, ten millions of volumes are annually printed. As the catalogue of every Leipzig half-yearly book-fair contains the names of more than a thousand German authors, we may compute that at the present moment there are living in Germany about fifty thousand men who have written one or more books. Should that number increase at the same rate that it has hitherto done, the time will soon come when a catalogue of ancient and modern German authors will contain more names than there are living readers. . . . In the year 1816 there were published for the first time more than three thousand books; in 1822, for the first time, above four thousand; in 1827, for the first time, above five thousand; and in 1832, for the first time, above six thousand; the numbers thus increasing one thousand every five years. (Gordon's Translation of 'Menzel's German Literature.') The translator adds, from the *Conversations-Lexicon*, the numbers published annually to 1837, in which year they were nearly eight thousand." So that, during those five years, the increase was nearly *two* instead of *one* thousand. A rough calculation of Heyse's Catalogues for 1846 gives us eleven thousand as the number there recorded for that year, and we do not believe, judging from the catalogue which has suggested these remarks, that the whole number for 1848 will fall at all short of

this. Quite a respectable number that, we should think, for the first year of revolutions.

It is true that a comparison of these catalogues shows that the public mind is now directed to some subjects with considerably more interest than formerly, whilst in some departments of literature the falling off is very remarkable. Thus in the department of "Staats- und Rechtswissenschaft. Politik. u. Statistik," (The sciences of Statesmanship and Law—Politics and Statistics,) the number of publications is nearly doubled. It is curious to observe, too, that this is the first time our familiar word "politics" makes its appearance in the German catalogues—a very significant and important addition, undoubtedly, to the old "staatswissenschaft." But in the department of Theology, *the falling off* is comparatively nearly the same, whilst Philosophy fares no better. This we do not think is a subject of any great regret, for we suspect that it is mainly such theology and philosophy as that of D. Strauss and B. Bauer that have "fallen off;" these gentlemen now finding in politics a much more congenial theme for the exercise of their talents. We hesitate not to say that the sooner such gentlemen give up theology and philosophy altogether, the better it will be both for them and for the world in general, and for Germany in particular. But to the friends of orthodoxy, could our voice reach across the Atlantic, we would say, now is the time for you to exert yourselves. Formerly "while you slept the enemy came and sowed tares;" improve now the opportunity that you have of retrieving what you have lost. Instead of wasting your time in wailing over what you so generally regard as the "new and damnable heresy" of revolution, make use of the liberty which is thus given you to reorganize the church in accordance with the principles of that greatest and wisest of revolutionists, Luther. Labor to infuse new religious life as you see politicians laboring to infuse new political life into the people, and be assured that you will not labor in vain.

Doubtless many good works in theology, as well as in other departments of literature are for the present suspended or retarded in their appearance, but we may hope that this evil is only temporary. Besides, there is some truth in what Dr. Ullman says in his preface to the volume of the "Studien u. Kritiken" for 1849, pp. 4, 10, 13: "We have, in fact, suffered from a surfeit; it is good for us to be put upon a simpler diet, and placed in a condition not only

to taste what is presented to us, but to digest it in a healthy manner. Our existence really continued more and more to threaten to be a one-sided literary one; it is salutary for it to be again re-established more upon actual life, that subjects may be presented to us that more deeply concern man, and questions started that can only be solved out of the depths of the human mind and character. Even theological literature may now admit of considerable thinning; the trees of its forest stand too thickly together; if the number of shoots is somewhat diminished, the more vigorous and more healthy trees will have room to grow the higher, and to spread their branches the more widely." "Science, indeed—this, verily, is the sorrowful and lossful experience of us Germans especially—science, verily, is not the only thing that makes a people great." "Theology, especially, is no abstract science, but, taking its rise in the depths of our life, it finds its ultimate object and goal in *life*."

There have not been, and we hope there never will be, men wanting among those most distinguished in German literature, and in German theology especially, who have fully understood this, and, so far as their circumstances permitted, acted in accordance with it. Luther, Paul Gerhardt, Arndt, Francke, Spener, Oberlin, and some whom we could name in our day, have undoubtedly been eminently *practical men*. And as Germany stands confessedly at the head of the civilized world in *theory*, we hope that she will now, permitted to act more freely, put herself in an equally advantageous position in *practice*, and by the union of the two, attain the highest elevation and happiness that can be realized by our fallen and imperfect nature here upon earth. Hoping to see continually increasing and brightening indications of this in her literature, we shall always examine with deep interest these semi-annual catalogues which advise us of what is passing in the German mind. The American public, and especially that part of it more immediately interested in German life and literature, as the readers of the Evangelical Review generally are, are under great obligations to Mr. R. Garrigue, the enterprising publisher of this catalogue, for the facilities which he thus, and by his promptness in supplying any work issued from the German or Scandinavian press, gives for our intellectual intercourse with Germany, and with the kindred mind of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark.

2. *The works claiming to be the Constitution and Canons of the Holy Apostles, including the canons, Whitson's version, revised from the Greek, with a Prize Essay at the University of Bonn, upon their origin and contents; translated from the German by Irak Chase, D. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway, 1848.*

This book is a most valuable addition to our theological literature. True, these Constitutions and Canons, called "Apostolic," and referred to the inspired penmen of the New Testament as their authors, or even to Clement, as their collector, are a most impious and manifest forgery; still, there is no doubt that they belong to a very early period of christian literature, and throw great light upon the religious life and earlier history of the church. Besides, they have exerted such an influence upon the form and fortunes of the church, now for more than a thousand years, and give us, as it were, the very germ out of which has sprung the whole system of papal despotism and hierarchical assumption, that no intelligent theologian can well afford to be ignorant of them.

The learned investigation of the sources, and searching analysis of the contents of these writings, presented in the able essays of Dr. KRAEBE, are well worthy of study. They throw great light upon that impious system of "pious fraud" by which the "mystery of iniquity" early began to work, and by which, mainly for the purpose of establishing the power of the clergy, or rather, of the bishops, not only such works as the "Heavenly Hierarchy of Dionysius," and the undoubtedly spurious epistles of Ignatius were forged, but likewise works of truly apostolic men, such as Polycarp and Ignatius, were mutilated and corrupted and made to teach doctrines of which their authors never dreamed. We have no doubt whatever that this system of forgery and interpolation has been carried much further than is commonly suspected, and we cannot but regard it as a remarkable instance of divine interposition that, under such circumstances, the integrity of the scriptures has been so wonderfully preserved. What, indeed, was to prevent those whose champions have taught that "the end justifies the means," and who have exalted the authority of a translation, often manifestly incorrect, above that of the original records of the divine word, from laying violent hands upon that word itself, whose free circulation among the people they have so greatly feared and

so violently denounced? Nothing, we believe, but the fear of exposure, and the direct intervention of Him who gave that word to the world. But to return to the book before us:—

Dr. Chase has performed his part of this work very creditably to himself. His translation generally reads well, is clear and satisfactory, and, we presume, faithful to the original. Some of the sentences are a little stiff, but such things will creep into translations. The Dissertation on the Canons was originally published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, that best of our American reviews, which is almost in itself a sufficient guarantee of its merit. The enterprising publishers have brought out this book in their best style, and deserve, and will no doubt receive, the thanks of our theologians generally.

3. *The unaltered Augsburg Confession, as the same was read before, and delivered to, the Emperor Charles V., at Germany, June 25th, 1530: And the three chief symbols of the Christian Church: with historical Introductions and critical and explanatory Notes.* By Christian Heinrich Schott, pastor of St. Peter's Church in Liepsic. Carefully translated from the German. New York: Printed and published by H. Ludwig & Co. 1848.

This translation is an important contribution to the literature of our American church. We fear that there are great numbers of our church-members who do not possess, and many who have never seen the venerable *Confessio Augustana*—the confession to which, assuredly, we still adhere. We feel grateful to Mr. Ludwig for thus offering it to our people in a neat form, at a very moderate price, and with very valuable additions, as pointed out in the title, given above. The Historical Introduction to the Augsburg Confession contains a succinct, but well-told, and, for ordinary purposes, quite satisfactory narrative of the origin and progress of the Reformation, up to Luther's death, expatiating more particularly and extensively on the preparation and presentation of the confession itself, detailing sundry important particulars respecting it, and giving an account of the disputes between the Lutheran and the Zwinglians. The notes are judicious and instructive, containing much matter that must prove interesting and valuable to general readers, and also to ministers who may not have access to original sources. A book of this kind has long been a desideratum in our

American church, and we sincerely hope that it will have an extensive circulation. Its chief defect consists in the numerous Germanisms of its worthy and faithful translator. But as these do not, in many instances, materially obscure the sense, and hoping that they may be remedied in a future edition, we cordially commend the work to the careful perusal and study of American Lutherans.

4. *An Historical and Critical View of the Speculative Philosophy in the nineteenth century.* By J. D. Morell, A. M. complete in one volume. From the last London edition. New York, Robert Carter, 1848.

This work, which has met with an exceedingly favorable reception in Europe, has, perhaps, scarcely attracted, in this country, all the attention which it deserves. It is far superior to any thing of the kind ever before attempted in the English language: nay, it is the only full and satisfactory account, historical and critical, of modern philosophy that we possess in the English language. The author has evidently brought to his work peculiar and eminent qualifications. His acquaintance with the progress of philosophic speculation and inquiry, from the earliest times, and with the many systems that have been at different times promulgated, is comprehensive and profound. He devoted a long time to the study of philosophy; became first a disciple of Dr. Thomas Brown, but subsequently learned, better than he had done before, to appreciate the philosophy of Reid. Yet, not satisfied with the results thus far attained, and "hoping to probe the questions relating to the foundation of human knowledge more to their centre," he "attempted to read Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*," and some few other continental works; but they, for the most part, opened a region so entirely new, that he felt quite unable to compare their results, *as a whole*, with those of the Scottish metaphysicians.—"Desirous, however," he continues in his preface, "of pursuing the subject still further, I repaired to Germany; I heard Brandis and Fichte expound German philosophy in their lecture-rooms, and spent some months in reading the standard works of the great masters. The different systems, which were here contending for the preference, gradually became intelligible; but, alas, they stood alone—in complete isolation; to compare their method, their pro-

cedure, their aim, their results, satisfactorily with those of our English and Scottish philosophy, appeared, as yet, almost impossible. To gain light, therefore, upon these points, I turned my attention to France; the name of Eclecticism seemed too inviting to be turned away, as it often is, on the charge of syncretism or want of profundity. And my hopes were not altogether deceptive. I found, or thought that I found, in the writings of Cousin, and others of the modern Eclectics, the germs of certain great principles, upon which a comparison of all the philosophical systems of the present age could be advantageously instituted, and saw that such a comparison would be of very important service to one who should be anxious to travel, as I had been, over the broad field of European metaphysics." "It was with a view of supplying the want which I had myself felt, that I began the sketch which has now swelled into these volumes; and it is in the hope that it may afford to others what I myself vainly sought for, that it is now ushered with all its imperfections before the public.

"The plan of the work, as a whole, may be stated in very few words. First, I have attempted to explain and illustrate the general idea of philosophy, and to deduce the fundamental notions from which it springs. Having grasped the idea of philosophy generally, I attempted next to point out the different views which have been entertained of its details; in other words, to classify the different *systems* which have been in vogue, more or less, in every age of the world. Having obtained four great generic systems as the result of this classification, I have endeavored, in the first part of my plan, to trace their history from the revival of letters to the opening of the nineteenth century; in the second part, to follow up that history more minutely to the present age; and in the third part, to discover their tendencies as regards the future." Preface, p. iv, sqq. We have given these quotations because the author's design is best stated in his own words, and his plan best described by himself.

The four generic systems referred to in this passage are: sensationalism, idealism, scepticism, and mysticism. As eclecticism is not, *sensu proprio*, a distinctly-defined, independent system, he does not designate it as such; yet, of course, it receives all due attention in the progress of his historical and critical discussion. In the present state of philosophical inquiry, we presume that the

author would himself prefer to be ranked among the eclectics—a school whose researches are very extensive, while the results attained are more reliable and satisfactory than those which are reached by investigations, however acute, which are pursued in any one isolated direction.

The work has been highly commended by Dr. Tholuck, Dr. Chalmers, and other European writers; it will be invaluable to those whose duty it is to lecture on the history of philosophy, and to present to classes of students a general view of the results at which metaphysical inquiry has hitherto arrived.

5....*The Germania and Agricola of Caius Cornelius Tacitus, with Notes for Colleges.* By W. S. Tyler, Prof. of Greek and Latin, in Amherst College. New edition. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway, 1848.

6....*The Histories of C. C. Tacitus, with Notes for Colleges.* By W. S. Tyler, Prof. of Languages in Amherst College. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway, 1849.

Perhaps no uninspired writer of antiquity, certainly no Roman writer is more interesting and more deserving of study than Tacitus. As a historian he has no superior, and to find his equal in the whole range of literature, ancient and modern, would not be easy. Even so far as mere style is concerned, and though he is classed in what is called the "silver age" of Roman literature, he will not suffer by comparison with the most brilliant of our modern writers, whether English or continental. Nay, we suppose that the most illustrious of those writers, Hume, Gibbon, Schiller, Lamartine, Macauley, would consider it the highest compliment that they could receive to bring them into any thing like a favorable comparison with him whom we must still pronounce "the greatest of historians." It is, in fact, almost amusing to see how Macauley, the representative of that latest form of modern literature, the Review, has, when turned historian, imitated the great Roman critic, not of books, but of human hearts. What admirer of Tacitus, when reading, for instance, the beginning of Macauley's History of England, can fail to be reminded of the commencement of Tacitus' histories? Take the following sentences as specimens: "I propose to write the history of England from the accession of king James the Second to a time which is within the memory of

men still living." "Initium mihi operis Ser. Galba iterum, T. Vinus consules erunt." The two paragraphs which follow the sentence just quoted from Macauley, seem almost an echo (and, we must say, a faint one, though musical,) of that magnificent passage in the second edition of Tacitus commencing, "Opus aggredior opimum casibus, atrox bellis, discors seditionibus, ipsa etiam pace saevum." And in the same manner, the third section of Tacitus may be said to have suggested Macauley's third and fourth. We might, in fact, show how the popular Englishman has reproduced almost every sentence of this part of our author whom most people would be disposed to designate as "the obscure and musty old Roman." But we have not here space to go into such an analysis. Nor do we design by this to derogate from Macauley's merits. On the contrary, we congratulate him upon his good taste, and cite this as another evidence in favor of the study of the classic writers of antiquity, viz, that they not only serve as the most correct models upon which to form the taste, but also invigorate and stimulate the intellect, and by the richness of their suggestiveness well reward all the time devoted to their perusal. We cannot, however, leave this subject of Mr. Macauley's imitation of Tacitus without directing attention to the identity of the plan upon which each proceeds. Tacitus commences by foreshadowing the great events which he is about to unfold—Macauley does the same. Tacitus briefly in his histories, more generally in his annals, reviews and sums up the history to the point from which he proposes to start out—"Ceterum antequam destinata componam, repetendum videtur, qualis status urbis," &c. Macauley devotes his first three chapters to this work. But to return to the books before us :

It follows from what we have said that we look with decided favor upon all attempts to familiarize students with this model of historical writing. Nor can we deny that few writers stand more in need of elucidation than our favorite. But here the fault is not his but ours; or rather it is a necessary result of the progress of time and of the difference of language by which we are so widely separated from the age in which Tacitus wrote. But why, it may be asked, why is Tacitus so much more obscure than the Roman writers by whom he is preceded, or than his contemporaries even? Because he is the perfection of them all, taking them all up into himself and condensing and concentrating all their vigor in himself,

besides adding much that is peculiarly his own. In order to understand Tacitus, therefore, we must be familiar not only with his peculiarities, but with the whole circle of Roman and a great deal of Grecian literature. In view of this, it might be made a question whether it is proper that students in college, who can, at most, only get the elements of a classical education, should undertake the study of this author? A moment's reflection, however, will leave no doubt upon this point. It is the object of a classical course of study, among other things, to enable the scholar to enter advantageously into any department of literature to which he desires to devote himself, and especially to give him some idea of the character and contents of the writings of those master minds that have rendered an acquaintance with Greek and Latin literature indispensable to all who would wield the pen or the tongue, or form a correct estimate of those who have done so, or even enjoy the highest degree of intellectual pleasure and profit from the efforts whether of the speaker or of the writer. It is evident, therefore, that a classical course of study which should leave out this most philosophical of historians would be exceedingly incomplete.

But we suppose no argument is needed upon this point, and that no one will doubt the propriety of Prof. Tyler's design in preparing an edition of Tacitus for colleges. And, so far as we have been able to examine it, he has executed his task in such a manner as is not only creditable to himself, but, what is more important, highly advantageous to the student, whether in college or out of it. He has selected a good text, and accompanied it with excellent elucidations, both in his introduction and notes. The life of Tacitus, prefixed to the *Germania* and *Agricola*, is well written, and attractive, we should think, even to the general reader. And in the "preliminary remarks," preceding the notes to the histories, the editor rises still higher, seeming to have warmed with his theme and to have studied himself still more fully into the character and genius of his author. The notes are generally what such articles ought to be, "the happy medium between too much and too little," as one of our cotemporaries phrases it. In short, we hope that Prof. Tyler will go on to complete his series by a similar edition of the *Annals*, when American scholars, as well as the "studious youth" of our colleges, will have increased facilities for making themselves acquainted with an author from the perusal of whom

we may draw some of the most useful lessons of moral and political wisdom.

We should be guilty of great injustice did we fail to notice the elegant manner in which the publishers, the Appletons, have gotten up these works. They are printed upon fine paper, in a beautiful type, and, so far as we have read, with an accuracy unusual to the American press. The price also is moderate, which is not one of the least important requisites of a good school book. We have no doubt that this edition will commend itself very extensively to our colleges, and justify the undertaking of the enterprising publishers.

7. *A Manual of Grecian and Roman Antiquities.* By Dr. E. F. Bojesen, Professor of the Greek Language and Literature in the University of Sorø. Translated from the German. Edited by the Rev. Thos. Kerch. Arnold, M. A., Rector of Lyndon, etc. Revised, with additions and corrections. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Philadelphia: Geo. S. Appleton, 1848.

This is another of the Appletons' excellent series of classical works for schools and colleges. Like all their books of this class, it is beautifully gotten up, and presented in a convenient form and at a moderate price. A work upon this subject has long been needed as a manual for instruction. Adams', and Kennet's Roman, and Potter's Grecian Antiquities, though possessed of high merit, have long since become antiquated. Eschenburg, though an admirable work, that might very easily be adapted to the present state of the science, is entirely too extensive and too unconnected, and, consequently, uninteresting to the youthful student. But in Bojesen, we are inclined to think, that we have just the work that we want. That it is a book of uncommon merit might be inferred from the manner in which it comes to us. Written originally in the Danish language, (so we presume from the fact of its author being a Professor in the Danish University of Sorø—not Sorø, as our American edition, imitating the English, no doubt, has it,) it was translated into German by Dr. Hoffa, of Marburg, and from German into English by Rev. R. B. Paul, late Fellow at Exeter College, Oxford, himself, as we are told, the author of an extensive work upon "Grecian Antiquities." Edited by so distinguished a scholar as Mr. Arnold, it, almost as a matter of course, commended itself to

teachers on this side of the Atlantic, where it has also found a very judicious editor.

The character of the work is very well set forth by Dr. Osenbrüggen, in a review of it which appeared in the "*Zeitschrift für Alterthumswissenschaft*," p. 914 of the vol. for 1842, from which Mr. Arnold, in his preface, gives us the following extract: "Small as the compass of it is, we may confidently affirm that it is a great improvement (on all preceding works of the kind). We no longer meet with the wretched old method, in which subjects essentially distinct are heaped together, and connected subjects disconnected; but have a simple, systematic arrangement, by which the reader easily receives a clear representation of Roman life. We no longer stumble against countless errors in detail, which, though long ago assailed and extirpated by Niebuhr and others, have found their last place of refuge in our manuals. The recent investigations of philologists and jurists have been extensively but carefully and circumspectly used. The conciseness and precision which the author has everywhere prescribed to himself, prevent the superficial observer from perceiving the essential superiority of the book to its predecessors; but whoever subjects it to a careful examination will discover this on every page."

We have no doubt that the American edition is an improvement upon the English. The work could scarcely fail to suffer in passing through a German translation into English, and we are surprised that the translation was not made immediately from the original. In default of that, however, we cannot doubt that the course pursued by the American editor has greatly added to its value. He modestly tells us, in the preface to the American edition, that "All that has been attempted, in the edition now presented to the public, has been carefully to revise, throughout, the volumes of Dr. Bojesen; to add explanatory notes where they seemed to be needed; to amplify occasionally some paragraphs and sentences which appeared obscure, from the studied brevity which the author has everywhere observed; to give references to standard English works in history and antiquities; and to endeavor in every way to render the work perfect in its adaptation to the wants of American schools and colleges."

We have introduced this book into our course of instruction in Pennsylvania College, as a substitute for Eschenburg, and believe that the change will be decidedly profitable to our students.

8. *Cæsar de Bello Gallico.* Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard.
9. *P. Virgilii Carmina.* Phil., Lea & Blanchard.
10. *Sallustii Catalina et Jugurtha.* Phil., Lea & Blanchard, 1848.

We are glad to see an American house publishing this excellent classical series. Drs. Schmitz and Zumpt have been before the public for some time, and are extensively and favorably known as teachers of the classics. We are pleased with their editorial labors; they seem to understand the business to which they have devoted themselves. Practical knowledge of the wants of the student, acquired by long experience, has enabled them to furnish the kind of assistance required. The books of the series which we have examined are remarkable for the accuracy of the text and the judiciousness of the comments. The principles on which the notes are constructed are, to remove only such difficulties as the pupil cannot be expected to solve by himself, and to afford help to those who are willing to make reasonable exertions in mastering the subject of the recitation; they are not so copious as to supersede mental effort—only those difficulties which would be likely to impede the student's progress, are explained. The editors, in their preface, correctly observe, that nothing can be more destructive to the mental energies of pupils than placing before them annotations on a principle of indiscriminate translation; for, instead of causing them to exert their minds and acquire habits of exact reasoning and investigation—an important object in classical learning—the assistance so unduly afforded robs them of all motive for exertion, and deprives them of the invaluable pleasure of conquering difficulties, and of feeling that they have been instrumental in their own instruction.

Other advantages this series possesses. The text of each author is prefaced by interesting and important biographical and critical sketches in English, in order that the learner may be made acquainted with the character and peculiarities of the work, the study of which he is about to commence. The maps and illustrations with which the volumes are embellished, greatly enhance their value. Their cheapness is also another recommendation—the price being considerably less than that usually charged. And as any effort to reduce the expenses of a liberal education, even in the item of text books, ought to be met with encouragement, we trust the publishers will receive the favor they deserve.

It is proposed to continue the series, and we shall be glad to learn that sufficient patronage has been extended to the publishers to justify them in the enterprise so auspiciously commenced.

11. *A History of Rome from the earliest times to the death of Commodus.* By D. Leonard Schmitz. Andover: Allen, Morrill & Wardwell.

The increased attention which is devoted to the study of history, we regard as a most encouraging feature in our system of education, and we are pleased to see this subject, at last, securing that place in our elementary course of study which its importance demands. The multiplication of text-books we hail with delight, as it indicates a higher appreciation of the value of historical studies than formerly existed among us. The history whose title-page has been given, is a valuable one. Whilst it is admirably adapted to the school-room, the general reader will find it an entertaining and instructive narrative. It furnishes a clear and condensed account of the leading events which have transpired in that remarkable country from the earliest period of its history till the death of Commodus. The author, at present rector of the high school at Edinburgh, one of the oldest and most important classical institutions in Great Britain, seems admirably qualified for the task he has undertaken. Born in Germany, yet having lived sufficiently long in England to appreciate the wants of English schools, a pupil of the celebrated Niebuhr, and having gone through the extended classical course of the German gymnasium and university, we would suppose him peculiarly fitted to prepare a history of Rome for schools. From the examination we have been able to give the volume, we regard it as a most successful effort, and think that it will not disappoint expectations. The work is, in a high degree, adapted to the object in view, and will serve as an excellent introduction to the more extensive works of Niebuhr and Arnold. Its perusal is likely to awaken an interest in the study of a country which embraces substantially the annals of the world, and at some of its most important periods. We shall be glad to see the book take the place which it so richly deserves in our classical schools.

CONTENTS OF NO. II.

Article.	Page.
I. THE SWEDISH CHURCHES ON THE DELAWARE; By William M. Reynolds, Prof. in Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.	161
II. THE PRINCIPLE OF PROTESTANTISM DISPLAYED IN ITS CONSEQUENCES,	199
Translated from the German of Dr. G. Thomasius, of Erlangen, by President C. F. Krauth, D. D., of Gettysburg, Pa.	
III. CATECHIZATION,	221
By John G. Morris, D. D., of Baltimore, Md.	
IV. THE RELATION OF OUR CONFESSIONS TO THE REFORMATION,	234
By Rev. Charles F. Krauth, A. M., of Winchester, Va.	
V. EARNESTNESS IN THE PREACHER,	263
By Rev. J. Few Smith, A. M., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. York.	
VI. PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL SYNOD,	276
VII. EXEGETICAL ELUCIDATION OF MARK 9: 49, 50.,	288
Translated from the German by Prof. H. L. Baugher, D. D., of Pennsylv- ania College, Gettysburg, Pa.	
VIII. WINER'S BIBLE DICTIONARY,	297
IX. RUDELBACH AND GUERICKE'S JOURNAL,	304

CONTENTS.

X. HYMNS FROM THE GERMAN OF LUTHER, . . .	308
By William M. Reynolds.	
XI. PAUL GERHARD: A BALLAD, . . .	310
XII. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.— GERMANY, . . .	313
1. Guericke's Church History,	
2. Harless' Sermons,	
3. Rudelbach's Christian Biography,	
4. German Booksellers' Semi-annual Catalogue,	
XIII. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS, . . .	316
1. The Mercersburg Review,	
2. Prof. Schaff's Kirchenfreund,	
3. Wayland's Sermons,	
4. Proverbs for the People: or Illustrations of Practical Godliness,	
5. Schmitz' Grammar of the Latin Language,	
6. Q. Curtii Rufi de gestis Alexandri Magni,	
7. Putz' Manual of Ancient Geography and History,	
8. Compendium of English Literature.	

DELINQUENT SUBSCRIBERS.—Whilst the great body of our subscribers have promptly complied with our terms in reference to payment in advance, there is still a considerable number who have neglected to do so. We should not send this No. to such, but we know that most of them are persons who can be depended upon, and suppose that circumstances have accidentally prevented them from forwarding the money. We, therefore, still send them this No. hoping that they will now at once discharge their obligations. We will still give such of our friends credit for advance payment if they forward us *five dollars* each, which will pay for the first and second volumes, or *three Dollars* for the first volume alone. Those who find themselves unable to pay, we are willing to exonerate from so doing, provided they now promptly return to us both the first and second Nos. which they have received, *paying the postage when they send them by mail*. We send receipts for all money forwarded to us, and our agents are requested to give receipts for payments made to them. If any money has been forwarded by mail and no receipt given, we wish to be informed of it *immediately*.